

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of citizens of the State of Wisconsin, protesting against the Lever oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany bills for the relief of Marcus F. Nesmith (H. R. 21439) and James Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Group No. 1224, of the Polish National Alliance of the U. A. of N. A., of Rockford, Ill., protesting against passage of immigration bills, providing for the educational test, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of G. E. Wiltse & Son, of Waterman, Ill., favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Robert Daring, R. F. D. No. 2, and Truman L. and L. N. Cleveland, R. F. D. No. 5, all of Rockford, Ill., favoring the establishment of a parcel-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARNER: Petitions of citizens of Corpus Christi and Fort Worth, Tex., for enactment of the Berger old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Union Church Mass Meeting, of Scottsdale, Pa., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of Nicholas Gahr, of Haynes, N. Dak., asking that the duties on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of North Dakota Sunday School Association, for enactment of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Edmore, N. Dak., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Elbowoods, N. Dak., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petitions of Mart, Waco, and West, Tex., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Bridgeport, Tex., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of J. R. Beckett and 100 other citizens of Faulkner County, Ark., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KOPP: Petition of citizens of Reedsburg, Wis., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of heirs of Charles G. Knight (H. R. 22411); to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Douglas County, Minn., for enactment of the Haugen oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Homer City, and Glade Run Presbyterian Church, of Dayton, Pa., for enactment of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Memorial of the Camas (Mont.) Hot Springs Commercial Club, relative to irrigation of the Flathead Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, urging agricultural demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCCOY: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Irvington and Newark, N. J., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: Petition of residents of Grampian, Pa., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Granges Nos. 96, 223, 290, and 1284, Patrons of Husbandry, for a governmental system of postal express; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of citizens of the State of New York, for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Dundee, N. Y., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Alton, N. Y., and the Ministers' Association of Newark, N. J., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petition of citizens of Denison, Tex., in favor of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REDFIELD: Memorial of the Seamen's Church Institute of New York, for enactment of Senate bill 2117; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Order of Railway Conductors, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, for enactment of House bill 20487, the Federal compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Camp No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, of Meriden, Conn., for enactment of House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Grange No. 10, Patrons of Husbandry, of Kent, Conn., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, for establishment of a naval base on Narragansett Bay, in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of citizens of Holly, Mich., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of California, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Melville Jeffrey, of Los Angeles, Cal., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Order of Railway Conductors, Order of Railway Telegraphers, and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, for enactment of House bill 20487, Federal accident compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Camas (Mont.) Hot Springs Commercial Club, relative to irrigation of the Flathead Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, for agricultural demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of citizens of Creston, Iowa, for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNBULL: Petition of Thomas F. Goode and 45 other citizens of Mecklenburg County, Va., against the establishment of a parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Grange No. 426, Patrons of Husbandry, of Prattsburg, N. Y., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: Petition of sundry citizens of Addison, Mich., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Petition of W. E. Jordan and others of Murchison, in favor of legislation prohibiting gambling in farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 1, 1912.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who hast been our refuge in all generations, we come before Thee with bowed heads and saddened hearts over the great loss we have suffered. We know indeed that the way of man is not in himself alone, and that it is not in us who walk to direct our steps. Therefore we submit our lives unto Thee, whose we are. Though Thou slay us, yet will we put our trust in Thee. Deepen in us, we pray Thee, the confidence that amid all earth's changes Thou changest not, and fulfill unto us the promise that Thine unfailing love shall be sufficient for our deepest sorrow.

And unto Thee, our Father, who hast loved us with an everlasting love and hast given us comfort and good hope through the gospel, be glory and praise now and for evermore. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the last legislative day, Thursday, March 28, when, on request of Mr. CULLOM and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF SENATOR ROBERT LOVE TAYLOR.

Mr. LEA. Mr. President, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the Senate the death of my colleague, Hon. ROBERT LOVE

TAYLOR, a distinguished Member of this body and three times governor of the State he represented in the Senate. He died yesterday at Providence Hospital in this city.

I fully appreciate the profound sorrow which his death has occasioned in the hearts of the Members of this body, for in my short experience here I have learned of the affectionate regard in which he was held by Senators on both sides of the Chamber.

It is not now the proper time for any extended remarks upon Senator TAYLOR's distinguished public service and his eminent character, but at the proper time I shall ask the Senate to suspend temporarily its business that fitting tribute may be paid to his high character and distinguished public service.

At the present time I offer the following resolutions, and ask for their adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 271) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. ROBERT LOVE TAYLOR, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. TAYLOR.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect his remains be removed from Washington to Nashville, Tenn., for burial in charge of the Sergeant at Arms, attended by the committee, who shall have full power to carry these resolutions into effect.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed as the committee under the second resolution Mr. LEA, Mr. BACON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. BOURNE, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. OYERMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. PAGE, Mr. WATSON, and Mr. KERN.

Mr. LEA. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1912, at 2 o'clock p. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 1, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee Almighty God our heavenly Father with glad hearts, rejoicing in the possession of life with its splendid environment, its lofty hopes and glorious aspirations, which are ever moving us onward and upward to higher manhood. Strengthen, we beseech Thee, our faith in Thee, that when sorrows gather about us we shall not fall, when the storms of adversity burst upon us we shall be firm, and when temptations roll in upon us like the mighty waves of the ocean we shall be strong to resist, for "He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty."

Touched by the sudden death of another one of the congressional family, whose smiles and cheering words brought sunshine into the hearts of thousands, comfort his many friends and bereaved family with the thought that he still lives to the larger life in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 30, 1912, was read and approved.

SERVICE PENSION BILL.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I call up the bill (H. R. 1) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, with Senate amendments, and move that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana reports the bill H. R. 1, and moves to disagree to the Senate amendments and asks for a conference. The question is on disagreeing to the Senate amendments.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. SULLOWAY.

THE WOOLEN SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 22195, to revise the woolen schedule.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 22195, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in the concluding hours of the debate on this pending measure—the woolen schedule, commonly known as Schedule K—it is apparent that no argument which can be made will in any manner affect the terms of the bill as it will pass the House; but the debate has shown conclusively that the Democratic bill framed in the last session of this Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means, and which was adopted by the Democratic caucus and is identically the same as the pending bill, should have been passed into a law at that time, so that relief might have been then given to the people of the United States. The Republican objections to it have all been met. The reasons for delay have been shown to be groundless. The President's veto of the measure was an exercise of Executive authority—no matter how honestly exercised—which resulted in placing upon the people of the United States the burden of Schedule K for one year longer, a burden which he himself had previously said was indefensible from any standpoint. The Republican position in politics is the opposite of the position of the Democrats in principle and policies; and it might be well, while we consider these various schedules and the revision of them from time to time, to stop and consider why the Republican Party stands out against every reform proposed in the interest of the common people. While they profess allegiance to American industry and American labor, they continuously oppose every measure that tends to free industry from embarrassment or ameliorate the conditions of labor. When driven from one position they fall back to another; but the fight is continuous, and always to prevent reform.

The difference between the Democratic and the Republican tariff is as distinctive as the difference between equal rights and special privileges. The Democratic Party has always looked upon the Constitution as a charter from the people of all the States which gives to the National Government only the power expressed therein, the limitations to which should be as sacredly guarded as the power conferred should be wisely and efficiently executed. The constitutional power of the Congress to levy a tariff on imports was intended as a means of raising revenue for the administration of the Federal Government. It is a tax pure and simple, and the principle of economy applies as well to the levying of the tariff as it does to the appropriation of the revenue derived therefrom. The Democratic doctrine maintains that no more revenue should be collected than is needed for the economical administration of the Government; that this revenue should be secured in the most just and economical way; that high rates of duty should be avoided; that the necessities of life should, if possible, be relieved from taxation, and luxury and wealth should be made to bear their full measure of the public burden.

The Republican Party, being both sectional and partisan, has constantly opposed the Democratic policy, and has in the last 50 years succeeded in building up, step by step and stone by stone, a tariff system and a tariff wall which have established monopoly of home industries and warped and paralyzed our foreign trade.

It has always been the pretense of protectionism that high rates of duty would give the American market to the protected industries, and at the same time labor would have a proportionately increased wage, and high prices to the consumer would be prevented by competition. None of these claims are true except the first. The protected industries have, indeed, full control of the American market, but labor has received no share of the benefit, and monopolistic combinations have destroyed competition. All the evils that were feared by its opponents have materialized without any of the good results that were claimed by its advocates. The cost to the consumer and to all unprotected industries has greatly increased; the cost of living has been made oppressively burdensome and American workmen have been forced to compete not only among themselves, but also with the hordes of cheap labor imported by the protected industries.

The whole system is wrong, both in policy and in morals. It stands in violation of equal rights and common honesty. Its mailed hand strikes with fearful force the principles of free government and the liberties of the people. The tariff on many articles is higher than the whole labor cost of production. It is levied not for revenue, but to enrich the privileged classes. It is, in plain words, a system by which the few are enabled to levy tribute on the whole country. It is so cunningly devised as to place heavy burdens on labor and secure for wealth immunity from taxation. The Democratic doctrine is reversed and the heaviest burdens are placed on the necessities of life in-

stead of upon luxuries. The Government is made to secure its revenue from the pittance of the poor, leaving practically untouched the untold millions of predatory wealth.

Were these statements new they would, indeed, be startling, but they have been so frequently made as to be almost trite, and yet no relief has been effected. For more than 30 years the people of this country have been struggling to secure revision of the tariff, lowering the rates and lessening the burdens; but this long warfare has been so successfully met by the beneficiaries of protectionism that instead of lower rates and lighter burdens the rates have been raised and the burdens increased.

In dealing with the question of tariff revision the Democrats in Congress have two great obstacles. First, the artificial environment of our industries to which they have been compelled to conform; and second, the immense amount of revenue it is necessary to collect in order to meet the extravagant legislation heretofore enacted by the Republican Party. In some instances a return to just and proper rates at one step might prove hurtful to some investments that have been honestly established under existing laws, and in other cases the necessity for revenue will not permit of reductions that could otherwise be made.

The Republican system of tariff legislation has been so complex that an accurate understanding of its real effects and burdens is almost impossible. The Democracy, however, true to its pledges, is determined to effect its revision of the tariff schedules with justice to all and for the interest of the whole country. The only hope of an equitable and proper tariff revision lies in the success of the Democratic Party. The Republican organization is determined to prevent revision if possible, and to circumvent by any and all means any attempt at revision. The stand-pat Republican controls the party. The Republican insurgent is a tariff reformer only on dress parade. He clings persistently to the doctrine of protectionism and thereby renders futile and absurd his reform theories.

As long as our tariff laws are written in the interest of protected industries, instead of for revenue only, the robbery of the people will continue as in the past. The insurgent's doctrine of tariff reform applies to everything except the products of his own district and State. The stand-pat Republican has quite a clear appreciation of this liberal spirit on the part of the insurgent, but exercising as he does the control of the Republican machine, he understands that a sufficient number of interests covering a sufficient amount of territory must combine and recognize each other's claims in order to make safe their own. The stand-pat Republican is working for such combination in order to keep his party in power, while the Republican insurgent is struggling desperately to keep apparently abreast of the Democratic reform element in his section, holding out a promise of relief through the Republican Party, in order that he may retain his seat in Congress.

Those who hope for reform can reasonably look to the Democratic Party alone, and those who would have the tariff revised in the interest of the people, whatever their party affiliation, should see to it that no protectionists are sent to Congress. A protectionist in the Democratic organization is more hurtful to the cause of tariff reform than a Republican occupying his place.

As long as the tariff laws are made by those who favor the few as against the many, just so long will the many continue to be robbed by the few, and in this connection I want to say that the most dangerous advocates of the special interests to-day are those who preach the doctrine of tariff for revenue only in States that are naturally Democratic on this issue, but who claim that the protection enjoyed by the manufacturer should be extended to the producer of raw material in order to equalize the burden of taxation. It is a dangerous doctrine because it is deceptive in its nature, has something of the appearance of fairness, and appeals strongly to the self-interest of those producing the raw materials.

Every time tariff protection is extended downward from the manufactured article to the raw material a new group of protectionists is created clamoring for more protection and joining in the cry with all other protectionists. Those who shout for a protective tariff on raw wool, for instance, support also the efforts of the woolen manufacturers to maintain a high tariff on woolen goods.

There should be no tariff levied for protection. The principle involved is very clear. There should be collected only the necessary amount of revenue, and this amount should be obtained in the most economical manner. A tariff bill made by the Congress on this basis would include in the dutiable list very few, if any, of the articles of commerce commonly known as raw materials.

The pending bill is the same which passed the House at the last session. It was then prepared by the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means and adopted by the Democratic caucus of the House. It reduces the present rates of Schedule K and would if enacted into law greatly benefit the country. It is a step in the right direction and should be followed at the proper time by still greater reductions. Woolen goods are perhaps more important in reference to health than any other item among the taxed necessities of life. It would be a blessing to the country if all manufactures of wool could be placed on the free list.

I do not intend to go into a general discussion of the bill, as I made extended remarks upon it at the last session, but in this connection I want to again call attention to what I then endeavored, among other things, to impress upon the Congress and the country in reference to the effect the present high price of woollens has upon infant life. I stated then, and assert it now, that the death rate among the young infants of the very poor is fearfully increased by lack of proper woolen garments. The discussion at this session, I am pleased to note, has brought out many strong statements along this line. There can be no doubt but that the exorbitant rates on the woolen schedule have caused the death of thousands and tens of thousands of American infants. In addition to this, the old, the sick, the feeble, who by their poverty have been unable to pay the high prices demanded for woolen goods, have suffered in untold numbers great injury to health and much loss of life. The outrageous exactions in Schedule K are miserably mean and pitifully cruel. It is a notable illustration that "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn."

All legislation should be enacted in the interest of the whole people. This everyone would admit as a sound principle. The influences, however, that have operated in the development of the Republican tariff system have not been exercised in the interest of the public, but with a view of bestowing special favor upon the privileged class. Greed has dictated the policy of protectionism and, shame to say, the special interests themselves have written the tariff schedules. The real history of tariff legislation in this country is almost incredible when we consider that for decade after decade a free people in a popular Government, who boast their love of liberty and who have in each succeeding election an opportunity to correct existing evils, should fail so repeatedly to assert themselves and to hurl from power the party organization which has so often and continuously betrayed them.

As every despotism pretends to be established in the interest of freedom, so organized monopoly proclaims itself the friend and protector of labor. Its slogan is the protection of American industries and American labor, while it seeks to shackle the one and enslave the other. It now shamelessly declares that combination and monopoly, which it has heretofore denied—even many times denied under oath—is but the natural outgrowth and evolution of modern civilization, and that the Government, whose laws they have defied and set at naught, should legalize their infamous policy.

The effect of protectionism on business has been to cut off foreign competition in our home markets, enabling protected industries to exact higher prices and greatly enlarge their profits, thus year after year building up great and growing fortunes, owned by the few, at the expense of the tolling millions who are victims of protectionism. As the holdings of the rich grew greater their capacity to organize larger business and widen their operations increased in geometrical ratio, controlling production and the various channels of trade and absorbing the great reserve wealth of our natural resources. To do this it was necessary to control the Government, which they have done with ruthless hand.

In the few minutes that I have in which to conclude my remarks I wish to call the attention of the committee and the country to the methods by which the Republican Party has been able to control the Congress, has been able to build up this tariff system which operates so oppressively on the consumer, the producer, and all the people. Special privilege has been built up because special privilege has controlled the lawmaking power. An assertion like that ought to elicit the earnest attention of every patriot, be he Republican, Democrat, Populist, Socialist, or Independent. If special interest can control the lawmaking power, the people have no rights that will be respected. I assert that the methods which have been adopted are plain when you study the organization and operation of the various Congresses. I shall not speak specially in reference to this Congress, but as to former Congresses. Look at the membership, look at their employment, look at the committees upon which they were placed, and when you find that those who are

interested in the protected industries and their officers, agents, and attorneys are upon the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House, and on similar committees in the Senate, it is very easy to understand that the legislation emanating from those sources will be poisoned with self-interest and with special privilege. The fact that the lumber interests write the schedule on lumber, that those who are interested in the Woolen Trust write Schedule K, that those interested in cotton manufacture write the schedule on that textile, that those interested in steel and coal and meat and in everything you can name in the whole catalogue of protected industries write the schedules affecting them, discloses the plot by which the public is defrauded.

The beneficiaries of special legislation and their officers, agents, and their attorneys sit and misrepresent the people on these committees and help enact such legislation as they desire. The result is that we have a system of tariff exaction more corrupt and more outrageous than any tax law that was ever passed by a free people. Yet you can scarcely awaken the masses of the people on the question. There seems to be a kind of lethargy not only among men in public life, but through all classes in private life, and they go on and on electing men to Congress who build up their own fortunes and the fortunes of their associates by using the legislative power for that purpose instead of exercising it for the good of the people. These words are not pleasant. It is a very unpopular task for anyone to undertake in a legislative assembly to lecture the members of that body along lines of reform which affect their business interests, their moral conduct, and the question of their fidelity to the people who have trusted and honored them. I assert in conclusion that the underlying prerequisite of all reform to-day is the getting a disinterested Congress to make the laws.

The only hope to-day is in the Democratic Party and in Democratic success. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will tell you, in this connection, that unless the Democratic Party eliminates from itself the poison of protection, and unless it passes a law forbidding Senators and Representatives to act as the agents, employees, attorneys, or officers of the corporations and others interested in legislation during their term of service it will not make good when it comes into power, because you can not get pure water from a muddy spring. Men who represent the interests will not represent the people. I hope that the Democratic Party when it comes into power will show, as it has heretofore shown by its votes in this Chamber, that this is its policy, and that it will scourge from the Congress of the United States those who are the officers, agents, and attorneys of the interests—all those who are the representatives of greed and graft. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, this is supposed to be the last act in the great tariff reforms of this present Congress. There may be another last appearance, I do not know. They are as numerous with this committee as with some of the celebrated actresses. This bill relates to a great industry. There are great interests at stake, I want to state to the gentleman from Texas, dependent upon tariff legislation in reference to wool, and the interests are very largely centered in the little homes of the country where the laborers in woolen mills live, and on the hillsides and mountain sides, and on the farms of the country where the raisers of sheep and the producers of wool also are getting their livelihood by reason of the wool of the sheep which is cared for in Schedule K. Now, some gentlemen seem to believe that a majority of this country are against protection through tariff legislation. They were never more mistaken in their lives. There were never more people in this country in favor of a protective tariff than there are this blessed day. [Applause on the Republican side.] They are not in favor of an excessive protection; they are not in favor of a duty which is higher than sufficient to make up the difference between the cost of production here and abroad.

A majority of the people are not for that, and that is where our Democratic friends make the mistake. They think after bringing in a wool bill or any other kind of a bill that slashes the duties without regard to the effect upon the industrial conditions of the country, that it will make them popular because they assume the majority of the country believe in free trade. The elation over the result of the election of a year ago last fall has taken away their ability to properly appreciate the facts and the conditions of the country and form a judgment upon those facts and conditions. They will find that out some day. You may go ahead and pass these bills. I do not know but it would be better for the country in the long run if you had power to put them on the statute books now. I do not know but it may be possible that the country needs another les-

son of 1894. That lesson was wholesome and it resulted in much good finally, although the immediate effect was widespread suffering throughout the whole country. But I do not believe it. Men's memories are not quite so short. You had an opportunity not alone to play to the galleries, but to show the people what you would do if you had power in the Senate and in the House and a man in the White House to sign your bills. The people of the country are looking into these bills of yours. They are comparing the effect upon the industry in which they are associated in some manner. The laborers in the country are looking into these bills. Why, in my district I heard the other day that the workers in the cities were forming tariff leagues, because they feared the threats of the Democrats and Democratic tendency in the country. Go on gentlemen, do not stop with this bill, I pray you do not stop; go right on with the whole program and show the country what you are going to do, so they will be able to appreciate it when it comes around to November, when we elect a Congress and elect a President.

Mr. Chairman, wool is not only important to the people engaged in that industry but to the whole country. I caught the word "tuberculosis" in debate the other day and I was surprised to be informed that tuberculosis generated in woolen mills. I do not know whether the gentleman carried it out to its logical conclusion that therefore he wanted to vote for your bill to destroy woolen mills or not, but when you do destroy them you will have to look out for something worse than tuberculosis even. You will have to look out among the army of the poor for pneumonia and other fatal diseases. We know we must have wool, gentlemen, in this climate of ours; we must have woolen clothing and woolen blankets for our soldiers in time of war, and it is just as much a war necessity as battleships; the Democratic Party are against battleships as they are against wool. They do not want any preparation for war, even to insure peace; all they want is a chance to divide up the offices, to play economy for one year, and show a less total of appropriations this year to be made up by deficiency appropriations after the election. What a grand thing they have done by omitting to provide for battleships. Gentlemen, the country is more intelligent than you take it for; the people of the country are more intelligent and they have their ideas in regard to battleships. They want them, and they are going to have them, and they are going to have them if they have to turn you sweet gentlemen out and put us in next time. They know what they want. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, the present Schedule K, Mr. Chairman, has been in existence substantially for about 50 years. It has been open to assault, and is now open to assault, and there are points where it is not defensible against that assault, and yet, notwithstanding its imperfections, there has ever been a sentiment in the country to encourage the raising of sheep and building up the woolen industry here; notwithstanding the assaults and notwithstanding the weakness of its defense as regards some items, they have maintained for about 50 years this Schedule K nearly in the form in which it exists to-day. But we agree that Schedule K should be revised. I have agreed with that sentiment for some time, and did not fail to so say, and I did not fail to embrace the first opportunity I had to attempt to revise it. And why? Well, now, the duty on the wools in the grease is not so much out of the way; it is not so much above the protective rate when you get right down to it and it is enforced.

Conditions have changed since that rate was first put upon the statute books; conditions have changed regarding the relative amount of wool that it takes to produce yarn and cloth and clothing and all that sort of thing, and the inequalities in the law have become exaggerated. No one will contend that it is necessary to have the compensatory duties upon yarn and cloth and clothing and tops that are included in Schedule K to-day; no one will contend for that who understands the subject, unless it may be the "expert" employed by the Committee on Ways and Means, who seems to be able to argue himself into any position. Those inequalities should be corrected—the compensation in each case should be no greater than is actually necessary to cover the amount of wool that appears in the article.

Mr. Chairman, in the Payne tariff law—against which there appears to be so much aversion and aspersion among gentlemen on the other side and certain newspapers that aided them, over which they have had considerable frolic for the last three years—there were some good points at least, and I could take up the rest of my hour to-day in speaking about them. Most of you admit them yourselves. It was the first tariff bill that ever had a maximum and minimum provision in it. We laid a maximum tariff with an increase of duty of 25 per cent, under the third section of the bill, against any country that would

not give us fair trade relations, and we authorized the President to go ahead and negotiate bargains with those countries and to get good terms. It was necessary to do it. They all had maximum and minimum provisions, and we were getting the maximum from them. It hurt our foreign trade.

My genial friend from Missouri, the Speaker of the House—I do not see him here now—wrote an article, published in a magazine at Buffalo under the editorship of Norman E. Mack, chairman of your Democratic national committee, soon after Congress adjourned, and in that article the present Speaker argued that this was a joker, that it meant 25 per cent additional tariff, and that after all we meant to increase the tariff in this country by an additional 25 per cent under section 3, and he predicted that that would certainly be the result. He was just as sure of that then as he was three years before of carrying the elections in 1906, and one year before in carrying those of 1908, and just as sure as he is now that his party will elect their President next fall. If he would stop and put on his thinking cap for a moment he would realize that section 3 did not do any such thing, but it gave the President the power to negotiate. And the President did negotiate under section 3. And then it gave him a little more power than that. It gave him the power to appoint a board. They did not call it a board formally, but it gave him the practical power and authority to appoint a board. It provided that—

To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section and the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, the President is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

Out of those words grew this Tariff Board, because it was demanded by the great majority of this country at that time. The President took advantage of section 3 to negotiate trade agreements with foreign countries, and he did negotiate. There were exported from the United States in 1909 manufactured articles for further use in manufacturing to the value of \$253,000,000; in 1910, \$287,000,000; in 1911, \$324,000,000. And there was also exported from the United States of articles ready for consumption, in 1909, \$467,000,000; 1910, \$541,000,000; 1911, \$639,900,000; showing a tremendous increase from year to year—a total in 1909 of \$720,000,000, in 1910 of \$828,000,000, and in 1911 of \$963,900,000. We are getting after those foreign markets—the markets of the world—under a live President, who is reaching out for them and using every means in his power granted by the Congress of the United States to bring about those negotiations and those agreements and a better rate on many articles exported to the various countries of the world.

And, superadded to that, our Consular Service has been improved and built up under a Republican administration so well that it is stated—and I believe the statement is not anywhere contradicted—that Emperor William has written a circular letter to his consuls, instructing them to follow the methods of the United States consuls in the same towns where they are, because the American consuls are so successful in extending American trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Well, we availed ourselves of that section 3 and appropriated for a Tariff Board, the present board. We went a little further, and we tried to make a permanent law for a Tariff Board, but that failed because of filibuster at the last end of the Sixty-first Congress by a band of Democratic Members, although our side of the House were for it and many on your side. In the Committee on Ways and Means every member was for it, and only one Democrat changed his opinion over night. We wanted the information. Why, even our friends over there wanted it in making a tariff for revenue only. They probably overestimated themselves, because when they got the information they did not know how to use it; but they wanted it then. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

This board went to work. They first went to work on the woolen schedule. Then, one day my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] brought in his woolen bill—a bill just like this bill, only with a change of the date, as he says—imposing a duty of 20 per cent on wool and a lower rate on manufactures of wool, and he brought in a report here that showed that he believed the effect would be so great in increasing the imports of wool, and especially of woolen goods, that there would be enough coming in to crowd out two-thirds of the American production of wool and woollens in this country—thus deliberately slaughtering the sheep and repeating the operation of the Democratic Party under the Wilson bill, when, in 1894, they destroyed the flocks and shut up the mills.

I can not understand the antipathy of Democratic gentlemen to the mills in this country. I can not understand why they put a duty upon articles that are used only as raw material for manufacture when there is nothing of the kind produced here. I can not understand how they will get up here and shout,

"Oh, it will make it a little harder for the manufacturers, but it will tax them, and therefore we put it on." I can not understand this political economy that believes that a workman will get more wages, or as much, when the proprietor of the factory in which he is employed is running behind every day and anticipating a loss of what money he has invested and the closing of the factory, and is not able to keep the factory running.

Why, you pledged yourselves time and time again not to destroy any industry. The gentleman from Alabama talks about the business of the people, and assures us that the Democratic Party is not going to hurt them, and then he smiles and stabs those people beneath the ribs with his free-trade bills, in which he assures us that there is no protection whatever, and that if any has crept into any bill he did not mean it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Well, they passed that bill, and then it went over to the Senate, and they jumped it up to 35 per cent on wool, and they finally agreed upon 29 per cent in conference, and got a bill before the President, and then they walked around saying, "Oh, we have put Taft in a hole now. That is the end of him." I told them then in the House that they had given President Taft the opportunity of his life, and he took it. He vetoed your mongrel bill, and he satisfied the country, who wanted intelligent action, upon the report of a Tariff Board, that the country should wait until we got that report before Schedule K was amended. After a while, on the 20th of December, we got the report.

How well I remember what consternation there was on the other side. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] did not seem to be in the House at the time. The other side did not seem to want to print the report. They had a premonition in regard to it—I do not know why. But finally they got it printed, and then the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] wondered that we could get any consolation out of it. I told him he would find that no Democrat could get any consolation out of that report, after we had heard the summary read, and they can not.

Did they bring in a wool bill right after that? No. Did they take it up right after that? Not at all. They brought in the same old bill. Why, they were paralyzed and dumfounded by that report. It destroyed so many of your theories that you had paraded before the country, swearing that they were the very facts. It destroyed them utterly. One of your theories was that the duty was added to the price in all cases and came out of the American consumer. For the first time this board demonstrated beyond cavil that that was a falsehood.

They showed the difference in cost between this country and abroad by a detailed report on numerous samples. They showed the efficiency of labor. Why, you have been testifying for years—of course, you did not know anything about that, but that did not keep you from testifying for years—that because of the greater efficiency of labor in this country, notwithstanding we paid double the wages, yet the unit of cost abroad was as great as it is here. They got the unit of cost and demonstrated it, taking account of efficiency and wages and everything else, and the unit of labor cost here is found to be double what it is on the other side.

Nothing in the report justified a 20 per cent duty on wool. Nothing justified a 29 per cent rate. The report shows that an equivalent of about 36 per cent is necessary.

The report fully vindicated the President of the United States. British looms run at higher speed. English weavers work at the looms for a lifetime, ours for only a few years on the average. It was the unanimous finding of the board, signed by the two Democrats on the board.

It recommended no rate of duty, but showed conclusively the difference in cost of production here and abroad. It was merciless and conclusive, in criticism of ad valorem duties on wools, which impose a greater duty in a high-priced market, when not needed, and a lower duty on wool in a low-priced market, when more protection is necessary. It proved that the specific duty on the "clean content" in raw wools was the best method of assessing duties on wools. It showed that such duties could be collected with certainty and with ease. It disclosed all the facts necessary in drawing a protective or revenue bill. I will quote the words of one of the world's greatest experts, Dr. Richard Schüller, one of a board of three experts in the Austrian ministry of commerce, whose sole work is to make industrial investigations as a basis for tariff legislation. This organization has been in existence for over 20 years, and has been the guiding body in two great revisions of the Austrian tariff:

IMPERIAL ROYAL MINISTRY OF COMMERCE,
Vienna, March 18, 1912.

* * * It is an excellent standard work. The Tariff Board has come within a very short time to the head of all the similar boards

established a long time since in the other countries. It is really true that no legislative body has ever had presented to it a better report on a tariff question. It will be also entirely impossible not to take your results in mind in proceeding to a revision of the tariff. It was a great mistake to stop the work of the board, and it would soon prove necessary to reestablish it.

RICHARD SCHÜLLER.

I do not wonder you looked around for somebody to try to destroy that report. I do wonder that you even stopped at Willis. I know you looked around before you struck him. And then you employed him to check up "our data," as the chairman said, with the report. You employed him to demolish the report. The result is that he has demolished himself, and he has hurt you, every man of you who signed that performance of Mr. Willis', which you now call your report. How many of you would like to get your names off of that document now?

This report of yours is a criticism of the Tariff Board's report on Schedule K from a majority of the Ways and Means Committee of the House written by a free-trade newspaper correspondent. It is mighty unfortunate that this report emanated from a person like the gentleman whom you employed, for it is not entitled to the dignity of a reading, hardly of a reply. The wonder is how it could get itself signed by a majority of the Ways and Means Committee and force for itself a recognition and a hearing which dignifies it into a respectability which it is not entitled to.

The early pages of the document are occupied with political-economy vaporings, which suggests a 10-year-old boy, who, having accidentally parsed a sentence containing the phrase, "the law of diminishing returns," thinks it means something. Whatever value or price cant phrases may have to a space writer on a newspaper that does not deal in news or on a lecture platform "for revenue only," such phrases have little place in a factory producing commodities for the market. To devote a page to showing that "money expenses of production" is a better term than cost of production may have advantages for the compositors in the Public Printing Office, who are paid for setting type by the 1,000 ems.

The cant and pedantry of the introductory essay on political economy could be ignored even though dignified by the indorsement of the Ways and Means Committee if it were not followed by pages of deliberate misstatements not only as to the methods employed by the Tariff Board, but as to the results of its work. Throughout this document the candid statements made by the board in its report as to the difficulties encountered are misused and distorted to make it appear that it is impossible to obtain cost of production, and these distortions are followed by flat statements that it did not obtain costs. This is the whole method of attack upon the sections of the report dealing with tops costs and yarn costs. The board fully and carefully explained the difficulties, the method adopted in meeting them, and in overcoming them so far as that was possible, and then exactly how it arrived at the best possible action in the case, and gives the reasons for believing that substantial accuracy attaches to its figures of costs on these intermediate steps in the manufacturing processes.

One is reminded of Mark Twain's reason for studying the Encyclopedia Britannica, "because," he said, "to juggle with facts one must first have the facts. I get the facts out of the Encyclopedia, then I juggle them." The "expert" of the Ways and Means Committee got his facts from the Tariff Board report, and then he juggled them. The cloth costs occasion the greatest venom on the part of this party who is able to get behind other men's names as a breastwork. The first attack upon the cloth costs, or cost of conversion from yarn to finished fabric, is contained in pages 28, 29, 30, and 31 of the committee's report.

The first objection is that the board did not use the aggregate output of mills over a long period to determine cloth costs, but adopted a sample basis. In other words, did not get the total cost of an indiscriminate medley of cloths to be used as cost of cloth in the abstract; but secured costs on definite units of production indicated by samples. Since, of course, there is no such thing as abstract cloth, the cost of which can be secured by dividing the output into the expense, as one would do with a coal mine, this objection seems to be that the Tariff Board is not composed of fools. But is this criticism indicative of the method the Ways and Means Committee, as at present constituted, would go at the cost of production of woolen and worsted fabrics? After criticizing the board for not using the sample method on tops where it was unnecessary and inadequate, this critic became furious because the sample method was used on cloths.

There are no standards of cloth; each mill turns out a large variety of fabrics, with almost infinite variations in weight, color, and quality. Selecting sample fabrics represent-

ative of grades and types of cloth was the only method open to the board for securing cloth costs. Bearing this in mind, let us examine this alleged criticism of the board's work. On page 28 it says:

It is found, therefore, that the board almost wholly dismisses the cost method of analysis when it comes to fabric costs. Instead it submits samples of given fabrics to the mills and permits them to give estimates on the cost of making these fabrics based upon experience with similar operations, but largely conjectural, because in many instances, probably in the majority, the mills had never devoted themselves to manufacturing this particular kind of cloth on which they were asked to furnish cost estimates.

There was nothing conjectural about it. In each and every instance the board had the actual cost on the sample from the books of the mill that made it. In each case the board had the full detailed mill or loom analysis of the cloth by the mill, showing exactly its construction and composition. If the board had no more than this—the actual costs of the originating mill—it would have had cost of production on cloths in this country and abroad, and have had more than Congress ever succeeded in getting before in any tariff hearing or investigation. But not satisfied with that, it took these samples to mills making the same general line of cloths. No mill was permitted to figure on the cost of any sample unless it made practically the same goods itself. The result was that on some samples there were a large number of costs secured, on others few, but always the cost from the original mill. No mill figured on all the samples, each mill selecting from the samples the ones with the manufacture of which it was familiar. The paragraph quoted above it thus seen to be deliberately false.

Now, as to the validity of cloth costs on a sample basis with all the facts as to construction of cloth, weight, quality of wool used, and so forth, being detailed in the specification, it would be reiterated that this is precisely the way every manufacturer figures his costs and fixes his price before he starts in to make up a line of styles for the trade. The Tariff Board did not go at its work in a way to suit this newspaper reporter, who gets a side-line job as "expert" from the Ways and Means Committee, but it did go at it in precisely the way every cloth manufacturer who attempts to keep costs goes at it, and in the only way by which intelligent results can be secured.

The cost reported on these samples was the typical cost in each case as determined by (1) the cost at the mill actually making the sample and (2) costs secured from 4 to 26 other mills making the same line of goods, on each sample. As to how representative these mills were the board prints a complete list of all the mills visited, and anyone who wants to know can examine them. Never in any Government report has there been a more candid and frank showing of just what has been done.

Now, on the foreign costs on American samples, costs were secured from as many mills as were obtainable which had made cloths of the type of the sample. On some samples more mills were secured than on others; in England the number of costs ran from 2 to 8, besides the subsequent checking by another experienced manufacturer.

In France costs were secured from 1 to 7 mills on the samples showing French costs. The foreign samples A to N are German-made cloths, and the German costs were taken direct from the books of the mills making the samples. In every case these mills were exporting goods to the United States, and goods of the grades as shown by these samples. Now, as to the number of American mills which figured the cost of making these foreign cloths in the United States, if you will examine these foreign samples you will know that very few mills in this country make fabrics of this grade. The Tariff Board secured costs from practically every mill in the United States which had made anything which would compare with these samples.

Much stress is laid upon the different methods of bookkeeping as found in the mills as being a bar to the possibility of securing cost of production. Any method of bookkeeping would show total or final cost. Mills that kept no cost accounts at all were not scheduled or considered by the board. Some mills did not keep process costs in the detail contemplated by the board's schedules. This would, however, affect only process costs, which, in the case of cloth, is not important, since there is not salable intermediary product. When the warp is put on the loom there is no salable output until the finished cloth is reached, and if you have the final finished cloth cost it is not important to show the process costs, and the board does not show these process costs even when it secured them.

Suffice it to say that in all new designs and styles of cloth put on the market, sold from small samples and not made up until the jobbers' orders are taken, the selling price is fixed upon cost of production figures secured by the manufacturers in precisely the same way. If it is a good enough method for the manufacturer to risk in taking orders for thousands of dollars'

worth of goods it will have to suffice whether it suits newspaper reporters or not.

In the so-called analysis of the report of the Tariff Board on wool and wool manufactures by the expert of the Ways and Means Committee the following statements are made at pages 9 and 10 (vol. 4):

Wages and Efficiency of Labor and Machinery in the United States treat a subject which has already been exhaustively discussed by the United States Immigration Commission in reports on the woolen industry, and the Tariff Board undoubtedly drew upon this source. * * * As a contribution to tariff discussion at the present time it has no value. * * * Taken in a general way as showing the status of labor in the woolen and worsted industry it is less comprehensive than the reports of the Immigration Commission.

Notwithstanding the fact that the report of the Tariff Board has been in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee since December 20, 1911, and that the report of the Immigration Commission, following it six weeks later, has been available since February 3, 1912, the statements by its expert show that neither of these reports have received even superficial examination at his hands.

The report of the Immigration Commission is almost entirely sociological. It deals with housing and living conditions of immigrants, their ability to speak English, their illiteracy, their citizenship, their conjugal conditions, the renting and owning of homes, and estimates of probable family income based on statements of weekly earnings made by immigrants and others in which for the week in question "no account is taken of voluntary lost time or lost time from shutdowns or other causes."

Volume 4 of the report of the Tariff Board deals with the experience, productive efficiency, labor cost, and wages, obtained directly from mill books of account for all operatives, and the production in each and every department.

The Immigration Commission report contains no data of this character in any table or text of its preliminary reports, nor in any of the 314 pages of its completed report issued February 3, 1912, six weeks after the publication of the report of the Tariff Board.

All of the Tariff Board data was secured directly from books of account in the mills during the six months from May to November, 1911, while the Immigration Commission material, for an entirely different purpose, was obtained from individual workers and in households mainly during the years 1908 and 1909, several years before the Tariff Board inquiry, and during which period many important changes had taken place in the industry.

And yet this expert, with the facts fully explained in both reports, states that the Tariff Board "undoubtedly drew upon this source," and that wages and efficiency of labor and machinery had already been exhaustively discussed by the Immigration Commission.

The Immigration Commission makes no pretense in a single line or table in its entire report of having obtained, presented, or discussed anything, even remotely, bearing upon the production of a pound of wool in any of its stages of conversion or of the manufacture of a yard of cloth, and does not even name a single machine or operation from scouring to weaving, much less a discussion of the efficiency of a man or a machine.

This expert says that volume 4 "is less comprehensive than the reports of the Immigration Commission." The investigation of the Tariff Board included mills and their employees in all of the New England States without exception, and New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, and Wisconsin, while the Immigration Commission's report includes only the North Atlantic States—omitting Vermont—for its immigration and sociological purposes. The Tariff Board presented data for 164 separate occupations in 44 mills for 35,029 persons. The Immigration Commission uses only a part of a single page in presenting wage estimates for 16 occupations in two mills. This fact alone indicates that in the investigations of the Immigration Commission such data, occupations, wages, efficiency, and machinery used was entirely foreign to its purpose. So much for the lack of comprehensiveness in the report of the Tariff Board.

This "expert" on the Ways and Means Committee says of volume 4 that "as a contribution to the tariff discussion at the present time it has no value," because "it deals only with American conditions." This is a most extraordinary statement and is as ludicrous and superficial as other parts of this ridiculous analysis of the report of the Tariff Board.

The demand for a Tariff Board to ascertain in a thorough and scientific way the facts relating to production was largely owing to the assertion that on account of superior efficiency American labor and American machinery were producing goods at a lower labor cost, notwithstanding higher rates of wages,

than our European competitors. Volume 4 is a complete response to every question that has been asked on the subject in every tariff discussion that has taken place in any and all parts of the United States during the past 40 years and have never before been answered. Volume 4 leaves no question relating to American labor and machinery in the woolen and worsted industry unanswered, and, used in connection with the ascertained facts in volume 3, the conditions in competitive countries are made clear and conclusive.

Volume 4 shows that we are not using American machinery in the production of worsted cloth; that we are importing foreign machinery at 60 per cent higher cost to scour, card, comb, draw, and spin the wool; and that this foreign machinery is of necessity operated to a great extent by foreign-born operatives having little or no experience in the mill industry or the occupation. It shows the number of years that the 20,227 machines and looms had been in operation from the number less than 5 years to the number of 25 years and over.

Securing in each establishment the earnings of each employee, the hours worked, the machines operated, spindles run, and the exact production during the period, the accurate labor cost per pound is shown in the production of 168 separate units. Included in this presentation are the pounds produced per one man per hour by the machine operatives and all others. It shows the cost per pound for machine operatives, nonmachine operatives, and the supervisory forces. This is followed by the wages of the three classes of operatives, and from these tables in volume 4 the American people have had solved for them in these 168 units, in all parts of the United States where the industry is carried on, the disputed questions as to whether high or low wages results in a high or low labor cost per pound of products. Yet the "expert" of the Ways and Means Committee and the committee itself has the effrontery to assert in practically so many words that the American people may not make use of these demonstrations in their debates of the tariff; that labor costs, efficiency, and wages have no place as factors in the present-day tariff discussion.

The Ways and Means Committee, and especially its newspaper "expert," with a nose only for sensational surface generalizations, dismiss, like all of his particular kind, the evidence and details of thoroughness shown in the report of the Tariff Board. He is apparently unaware of the fact that the costs of manufacturing tops, yarn, and cloth, shown in volume 3, were obtained in establishments from which the data for volume 4 were secured. He does not know that the labor costs of conversion of tops and yarn in all stages, of the 168 units shown in volume 4, were obtained independently of the costs shown in volume 3, and were used to verify and check the latter.

The study of weaving efficiency in the production of woolen and worsted goods in the United States, as set forth in detail in volume 4, is not alone a most notable and conclusive contribution to the literature of the subject at the present time, when successful shop management demands an efficient day's work to the end that American industry may be successful and extend its operations, but is of the greatest importance in its bearings upon the tariff question and the future of the woolen and worsted industry. If more than 60 per cent of American worsted and woolen weavers are below the average standard of productive efficiency, as shown at page 1052, and if unemployment and migratory movement from place to place and entering into other occupations has caused the employment during each of the past five years of upwards of 130 per cent of persons in the weave room in excess of the required number as shown at page 983, while in competitive countries there is greater stability and immobility and a much higher degree of efficiency among a thousand weavers, owing to their making it a lifetime work in one mill or community, the occupation descending from father or mother to son or daughter for generations, then these facts and conditions become paramount in all tariff discussions of labor costs, more especially in view of the insistence on the superior efficiency of labor in American mills.

If the "expert" of the committee were honest or thorough and conversant with the subject he attempts to treat of he would admit and point out the great value of the data for tariff purposes. But he has no personal knowledge of the industry, while he has a personal animus toward the Tariff Board. He was never in a woolen or worsted mill for over a day, if at all; is a newspaper correspondent, and for some years past has been engaged in writing sensational and abusive political dispatches of a column a day or over to a New York Journal. Surely not qualified to act as expert upon industrial conditions of production in American and European mills or to pass judgment upon the work of those who have spent months in the mills for this purpose and years in the study of industrial conditions. For

more than a year he has been wiring attacks on the board to his paper almost daily.

This is the manner of man and his "expert" experience which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has used to analyze the work and to pass upon the ability of the experts of the Tariff Board.

In connection with cloths the report is attacked because it employed the sample method, but in connection with the criticism of tops the board is criticized because it failed to use the sample method and to get comparable costs on a "sample of Australian wool." The answer to both criticisms is not far to seek. In figuring the costs on cloths the method universal in the industry is the sample method—that is, the cost of actual samples based on the book costs—while the cost method for a uniform product like tops is based on the bulk. The statement that the figures of the board on the cost of tops is conjectural (p. 22) is true, if figures are conjectural based on several hundred mill returns.

After the board states, with scrupulous care, the causes of variations in costs of combing, the committee report (p. 22) makes a point that the final conclusions are worth nothing because the board admits these variations. It is obvious that had the board been categorical in its conclusions it would have been open to a valid criticism, but that after it admits all the difficulties, it does reach a conclusion which it regards as fair, and it should be conclusive for those seeking not to destroy, but to get a valid expert judgment.

On pages 22 and 23 the writer tries to discredit the board's figures on tops by comparing costs and prices which he himself admits, on page 27, is unwarranted. He also assumes—because his argument needs it—that wool entering into fine tops would cost 50 cents per pound. He might have found, on pages 34 and 35 of the board's report, quotations which show that the very highest priced scoured wool sold in London in 1910 was at 50.7 cents, and that the average was about 45 cents—a difference at least sufficient to destroy his argument. In fact, the very best wool is not required to make the tops discussed by the writer.

On pages 23 and 24 the variations admitted by the board, which are inevitable because, in a complicated industry such as the worsted industry, such variations are unavoidable, are again used to discredit the board's figures. It would seem unnecessary to point out that this is to the credit of the board, and shows that its investigation covered all the factors which cause variation in the industry; but that in spite of this fact it finally reached a conclusion that shows the relative position of the industry in the United States and in England.

The board is attacked for furnishing incomplete yarn costs (p. 24), an attack based on the assumption that the board was expected to give costs on all grades and counts of yarn. This is obviously absurd. The board assumed not to give the costs by which rates could be fixed with mathematical precision on every count, but costs which show the relative position of the industry in the United States and in competing countries, and this is adequately done when accurate figures are given for the principal counts of yarn. The writer of the attack shows his ignorance of the industry in the United States when he accuses the board of not giving costs on the finer counts of yarn. A 2/60's yarn is undoubtedly a yarn of high count, usually made from fine Australian wool; and as for higher counts, they are made in such limited quantities in the United States that the board did not regard a comparison as pertinent.

A good example of the method of this attack is shown on page 25, when the writer makes a point of the fact that a clerical error crept into the mills and tenths of mills column of one of the board's tables. Any bona fide seeker of truth would have assumed that these were proofreaders' mistakes, since the correct figures occurred in two of the preceding tables. And it is also stated in the text of the report on page 650 that the figures are intended to be identical with those quoted on page 648.

On page 25 it is stated that—

There is no statement as to whether the comparison is based upon mills which are running full time in both countries.

And the critic makes the statement in the face of the fact that in the board's report it prints, at the head of the table from which the figure was taken, "Mill running full." It would hardly seem necessary to point out that, if the English figures are "fairly comparable," as the board says, that they, too, are based on mills running full time.

The writer assumed to say that the board's figures "are largely not comparable," as admitted by the board (p. 25), and this statement is made deliberately in the face of the board's statement that they are "fairly comparable" (p. 650).

On 25 the board's figures are said not to be comparable, because the costs were figures on the basis of different qualities of materials in the competing countries. This would seem to be a deliberate misstatement, for there is nothing in connection with the board's table on page 650 to show that the costs are not based on the same quality of wool, and in the absence of any statement it would seem that a fair-minded man would assume that the figures are comparable.

On page 26 an attempt is made to discredit the cost figures of the board on 2/30's by comparing costs with prices. He takes the board's price quotations for 2/30's at 40 cents, and the cost of converting them at 7.24 cents, and assumes that the cost of yarn material is 32.76 cents, which he says is "far below the average scoured-wool price of Australian wool or fine wool of any kind." To one unacquainted with the technical phases of the industry the board might seem to be discredited. But it is a well-known fact in the trade that 2/30's are not made from fine or Australian wool, but from coarse wool. It is a comparatively heavy yarn and the cheaper wools are used in its production. Furthermore, the writer of the attack, who proves to his satisfaction that the yarn material in 2/30's could not cost as low as 32.76 cents, had on page 22 of his attack quoted the Tariff Board's figures for 30/60's tops (yarn material) at 25.4 cents—28.4 cents, which may fairly be regarded as the material from which 2/30's are made.

On page 27 the writer makes an elaborate calculation on 2/60's yarns to show that the board's costs and the prices do not agree. These deductions are based on two assumptions, both of which are unwarranted:

(1) That yarn and top prices are affected by exactly the same forces and fluctuate together, which is an assumption that no careful statistician would make.

Second. That 2/60's yarn is made from 60's super top. But it requires better tops than 60's super to make 2/60's yarn. Seldom does a manufacturer attempt to spin a top quality to its limit, because the loss in breakage is more than the gain in fine yarn. This fact alone, if it were desired to answer such puerile deduction, would wipe out the difference shown by the "expert." This fact destroys the argument of the "expert" in connection with his table 4 (p. 27). In every case the quality of top used for the yarn would be higher than he assumes, and the discrepancy which he makes so much of would be wiped out.

The part of the attack which deals with the interpretation of the board's report (pp. 33-65) is really a high compliment to the work of the board, for it used the figures of the board to prove to the satisfaction of the "expert" that the rates in H. R. 22195 are proven correct by the report of the board. Thus, after vociferous denunciations and repeated assertions that the figures of the board are not worthy of confidence, confidence is placed in them in order to show that the rates in the Democratic bill are adequately protective to American industry, since they equal the cost of production as found by the Tariff Board. It therefore is evident that the board, and even the economic theory of the President, have from the lips of their enemies perfect praise.

Throughout these pages (pp. 33-65) assumptions and additions are made to the board's figures in order to bolster up the case of the writer. Juggling with figures, however, is harmless, and the interesting thing is that they have been so carefully used. Occasionally there is a misstatement of fact, as to where it is assumed that the cost of growing wool in Australia is 5 cents per pound, when the board says that there is against wool in Australia "a net average charge of but a few cents per pound," and "materially below the average South American," which latter cost is given as "between 4 and 5 cents per pound." (See p. 11, vol. 1.) It is interesting to note that the attack is really an argument for free wool—in which the writer evidently believes—but for some reason the committee thought 20 per cent was necessary.

On page 9 the report refers to the glossary of Schedule K as a compilation containing material which was already available. If he means by this that the material was available in the sense that material is available for writing a history of the United States, he is right. But it would seem that as the research into the sources of American history is regarded as an original and valuable work, so the bringing together of the information regarding Schedule K and the arranging it by paragraphs of the tariff act should also be considered an original and valuable work. The writer of the attack seems to recognize its value by the number of times he uses it.

These guileless colleagues of mine, amiable gentlemen on the Ways and Means Committee, would not have signed that report if they had known the facts in regard to the Tariff Commission report, and then had read this report written for them before they signed it. None of them desires to attach his name

to a deliberate lie, a falsehood. I acquit them. They were too guileless; they were too confiding. They were too terribly anxious to throw some doubt on this Tariff Board, but they did not act with their usual caution and prudence.

After the "expert" has denounced the report from "a" to "z" he finally winds up by asserting that the report is authority for a 20 per cent duty on wool, and according to the majority report that is a protective figure. And so he tries to bolster up the Democratic bill by that unwarranted statement.

The "expert" states in another place that the report authorizes free wool, and that it shows that free wool would do no damage to the industries of the United States, but would equalize the conditions here and in Australia. Then he says that the report shows that wool costs 5 cents a pound in Australia. That is another statement made out of whole cloth. There is no such statement in the report, and no such statement by which any man can fairly argue that it is in the report. I regret that my amiable friends on the other side have been inveigled into signing any such document without knowing what was in it and giving it respectability by signing it.

On page 43 of the committee's report occurs the following:

The cost of production of wool in Ohio as given by the board is 19 cents, on the average.

This is not true. That figure refers only to the merino flocks of the Ohio region. The average is 15 cents. The report then goes on:

Inquiries as to shrinkage show that this wool shrinks 46.62 per cent.

And a discussion of net scoured-pound costs follows, based upon that statement. The Tariff Board's report shows plainly that these 19-cent wools of the Ohio region shrink 60 per cent. This is only another evidence of the carelessness with which the board's work is discussed in the committee report.

On page 44 of the committee's report the comment is made that—

There is nothing to prevent either the western or the Ohio growers from shifting to the crossbred flocks whose profitability in the United States has been demonstrated to such an extent as to show no net charge against the wool.

No one having the slightest familiarity with flock husbandry in this country would be guilty of making such a statement. It has been demonstrated time and again that crossbred sheep will not thrive and can not be maintained profitably over large areas of the West, and that in the hilly Ohio River region the heavy-bodied crossbred sheep are not adapted to the peculiar conditions there obtaining. Speaking on this very point, the report of the Tariff Board points out, on page 550, that while it is important for the sheep farmers of these hill regions to seek, wherever possible, to produce fat lambs as a means of abating wool costs, there are difficulties, some of them serious, in the way; and some of these difficulties are then pointed out. The peculiar susceptibility of the crossbred sheep to parasitic diseases in the leading agricultural States is of itself a good reason why many of the farmers of this region can not adopt them and must adhere, as in the case of western ranchmen operating under harsh conditions, closely to the merino types.

Now this bill comes in the same as heretofore. In the former bill they had a 20 per cent duty on wool because of the "depleting and depleted" condition of the Treasury. We had a little kindergarten experience here, and I think that nobody that was here then will deny that I educated the chairman of the committee as to the condition of the Treasury and proved that instead of a deficit, as he alleged, we would probably have a surplus of \$35,000,000 or \$36,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year, June 30 last. I presume they have looked at it since and found that it is over \$47,733,642.22 for the last fiscal year. Possibly they have looked into it enough to know that all the efforts at tariff revision, after all the falling off in trade because of their efforts to reduce the duties and destroy business in the country, we are only \$10,000,000 behind what we were last year, taking into consideration the amount of revenue from the corporations that has been collected, and that we will have at least \$37,000,000 this year.

Your excuse is knocked out and you have not even the "God's truth" of the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the caucus, to rely upon when he swore with that kind of an oath in the House that your caucus resolution was right and that the Treasury was "depleted or depleting" at the time when it was full and overflowing—one of the splendid results of the present tariff-revenue bill.

Well, you have brought in again the same bill, with a 20 per cent duty. Why did you do it? Did you depend on this "expert," Willis? Willis said it was protective. Have you got around to the protection idea? Where are your free-trade notions? Where are the demands and the shoutings for free

wool? Why, have you not had cold shivers running through your audiences as you assured them that they were shivering to death because they wanted that great boon of free wool in order that they could have free clothing in the country?

What has become of your free-trade notions on wool? I know that you have passed a buncombe bill taking the tariff off from sugar, but sugar is not the necessity to every man and woman and child that wool is. They must have clothing in preference to candy. There are other articles of food as wholesome as sugar. But you took it off from sugar and put it on wool. You remember the words of your peerless leader accusing you of deception, another name for "perfidy and dishonor." Why did you do it? Did you do it because you could not help it—are you going over to the protection idea, or did you hope to put Taft in a hole? Was that your idea? The country does not care half as much about that as it does about testing your sincerity, about knowing what you believe and knowing whether you are honest or not and fit to be further intrusted with the Government of this country. It is a question whether you are honest; you are not going to put Taft in a hole. Well, here is a chance for you to get lower rates in Schedule K. We have introduced a bill here which is based on the Tariff Board's report, which any intelligent man in this House can understand, and taking that report and reading it you would see that we have endeavored to put on a rate of duty that makes up the difference between the cost at home and abroad.

It occurred to me three years ago when we were making the tariff bill. I had the hearings reopened and called in the experts to see if there was any way that we could arrive at the clean content in an ordinary cargo of wool. One witness said that we could do it within 1 or 2 per cent, and another, a Government expert, said that we could do it within a half or 1 per cent at the outside. I favored the duty on the clean content of the wool at that time. That gets rid of all the inequalities that makes it exactly even on everything we import that has wool in it. It is on the weight of the wool, whether it be in the fleece or whether it be in the tops or in the cloth. It makes no difference whether it is fleece to tops, tops to yarn, yarn to cloth, or cloth to clothing. There is no difficulty in getting at it. It is a matter of little cost to the Government and absolutely easy to determine.

Nearly a year ago I wrote a letter to the Tariff Board suggesting that they examine the question as to whether it was practical to put a tariff on the clean content of wool in the fleece, and asking them to make an examination of the subject and embody the result in their report. This they have done, and the report is unanswerable.

The minority of the committee examined carefully the report and came to the conclusion that 18 cents a pound on the clean content of wool in the grease fairly measured the difference in cost of foreign and domestic wools, taking the whole competing part of wool in each case into consideration. They therefore recommended the duty at 18 cents a pound on the clean content of wool as a basis.

The report then takes up the subject of wool in its various forms of manufacture. It goes into details, showing the waste upon each pound of the clean content of wool in turning wool in the grease into scoured wool, into tops, then into yarns, and then into cloths, and, finally, into clothing. The board found just how much this amounts to on the average, how much waste can be recovered and is useful for other purposes; and they present a statement showing exactly what weight of wool is required to produce a pound of each of the manufactured articles by adding the percentage of waste that is lost in the processes. From this it is very easy to fix the compensatory rates on all manufactured articles which will cover the duty at the clean content rate which is necessary for the compensatory duty on each class of manufactured articles. If you gentlemen will examine closely the compensatory duty in our bill, you will find a very large reduction from the rates under the present law, amounting in some instances to nearly 50 per cent. But we have gone further than that. We provide that this duty shall apply only to the weight of the wool and not to the weight of the cloth, as in the present law. If, for instance, cotton or other vegetable fiber is used, the weight of the wool actually used must be ascertained, and the duty levied on that only. The vegetable fiber is easily ascertained in given samples by the use of sulphuric acid, carbonization, and the removal of the carbon, a simple and easy process and very certain in its results.

The chairman says that we have put a higher rate of duty on the cheaper grades—on the poor man's clothing—than we have on the clothing of the rich. We asserted in the report that the duty was lower on the poor man's clothing, and I am ready to prove it now. There is no juggling with figures by us, and no

juggling with figures can change it. The chairman in his speech presented a table purporting to show the equivalent ad valorem duties on my proposed bill, H. R. 22262.

In paragraph 20 of the proposed bill it is provided that on yarns valued at not more than 30 cents per pound the duty shall be 21½ cents on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 10 per cent ad valorem; on yarns valued at more than 30 cents per pound and not more than 50 cents per pound, the same specific rate and in addition 15 per cent ad valorem. But in the table presented by the chairman the last provisions are all falsely classed as on yarns worth over 30 cents per pound, which raises the duty from 15 per cent as rated in our bill to 25 per cent. This is a glaring falsification of the facts of which no expert should be guilty.

In the next subdivision the chairman raises the duty on yarns valued at more than 50 cents per pound and not more than 80 cents from 20 per cent ad valorem, as stated in the bill, to 25 per cent, while more glaring errors are made in his statement on cloths, blankets, and clothing. The statement is wholly unwarranted by the terms of the bill. Further than that, the statement nowhere indicates that the specific duties in the minority bill are on simply the wool content, but it is represented that they are on the total weight of the article.

In paragraph 20 of the bill proposed by us, in the first bracket, the yarn is valued at not over 30 cents per pound. Such pound of yarn consumes 1.2 pounds of tops. Such tops are worth 50 cents per pound. If nothing but wool were used, as indicated by the chairman, you would have 60 cents' worth of tops as the material for 30 cents' worth of yarn. Of course such a result is impossible. A pound of yarn is worth, say, 30 cents. The foreign cost is equal to 10 per cent, as provided for in this bracket. Therefore, of this 30 cents of value 3 cents at least is the cost of conversion, leaving 27 cents for the material. In order to get the cost of material within 27 cents cotton must be used, while waste and shoddy will not do it.

By consulting the report we find that the average price of shoddy in England, per pound, is 16 cents; noils, 21 cents; thread waste, 28 cents; garnetted waste, 39 cents; merino soft waste, 49 cents. These are average prices. It is evident that these can not be substituted to make 30-cent yarns without a loss, and recourse must be had to cotton to hold the thread together. Suppose half is cotton and half is wool, a moderate estimate. The duty on the wool content would be for one-half pound of wool 10½ cents per pound. Ten and three-quarter cents is equal to 35 per cent ad valorem. This, plus 10 per cent, equals 45 per cent ad valorem. But in the last bracket on yarns, at 80 cents per pound, the all-wool specific duty, at 21½ cents, would be equal to an ad valorem of 27 per cent, plus 25 per cent, or a total ad valorem of 52 per cent.

A similar calculation on cloths shows that the average equivalent ad valorem under the first bracket is 50½ per cent. In the Underwood bill it is 40 to 45 per cent. Under the last clause, by a similar calculation, the duty is 72 per cent.

Paragraph 22, blankets and flannels, by similar calculation the duty under the first bracket on flannels worth not over 40 cents per pound, the ad valorem is 39.6 per cent, and in the Underwood bill 30 to 35 per cent. In the last bracket the equivalent ad valorem is 77 per cent.

Representative GREEN of Iowa brought in a piece of goods here, valued not above 40 cents, under paragraph 21, clause 1, which was 81 per cent cotton or about one-fifth of which was wool. The duty on this one-fifth of a pound of wool would be 5 cents a pound, or an equivalent ad valorem of 12½ per cent, plus 30 per cent of ad valorem duty, would be 42½ per cent.

In paragraph 23, first clause, clothing valued at not over 40 cents per pound, at least one-half the weight consisting of linings, paddings, and so forth, is cotton. On such cheap goods—the value of a suit of this kind would not be over \$3—the duty on one-half a pound of wool would be 12½, its equivalent ad valorem on 40 cents per pound would be 31 per cent, plus 35 per cent, would equal 66 per cent ad valorem. But if one-half the “woolen” goods were cotton, as almost invariably would be the case, the wool in a pound weight of the cloth would be one-quarter of a pound and the duty would be 6½ cents.

The average ad valorem on 40 cents would then be 15.6 per cent plus 35 per cent, or 50.6 per cent, as the average equivalent ad valorem. Supposing that the linings as well as the cloth were all wool and the duty 26 cents a pound on the whole weight, under the last bracket. Twenty-six cents is 17 per cent of \$1.50, which, added to 60 per cent ad valorem, would equal 77 per cent equivalent ad valorem. It is perfectly evident that this provision in the law, which allows duty only on the wool contained in the cloth, will result in an immense reduction of duty, the exact amount of which can not be ascertained

until the law is put into actual operation and the character of imports coming in under it are ascertained.

The board reports fully on the subject of the different materials entering into the total manufactures of goods, and they present a table by which it appears that nearly 14 per cent during the past year was of cotton. This was a lower average than for the previous years, but to take 14 per cent off the woolen duty prescribed by this bill and off from the calculation made by the chairman in his statement would result in an immense reduction of woolen duties.

The bill which the minority present lets in carpet wools absolutely free. I have heard some whispers of a “joker” in the carpet-wool duty, because the duty collected is 7 cents per pound. The duty under the present law on carpet wools valued at 12 cents a pound or less is 4 cents per pound, and on wools valued at over 12 cents a pound the duty is 7 cents per pound. This has restricted the importation of carpet wools, for the manufacture of carpets, valued at over 12 cents a pound, and has kept our manufacturers of carpets out of the market where the wools are worth 12 cents or over. The only necessity for any duty is that a small percentage, never estimated at over 5 per cent of such wools, are used in manufacturing clothing. These are wools of the higher grades and worth 12 cents or more per pound, because they have wool that can be used in the manufacture of goods as a part of the fleece. We provide that the duty shall be entirely removed, or paid as a drawback, when the wools have been manufactured into carpets, so that the result would be that carpet wools are entirely free unless actually used in the manufacture of clothing. We do this because carpet wools are not grown in the United States to any appreciable extent, and in accordance with the idea of protection there is no sense in keeping a duty upon them, as does Mr. Underwood in his bill.

Altogether our bill reduces the duties about 40 per cent, and makes large reductions all along the line in manufactured goods. I want to say to my Democratic friends, now honestly, between man and man, you have the opportunity of a lifetime. We will offer our bill as a substitute. That is opportunity No. 1, to vote for a bill which reduces the present duty on woollens 40 per cent, makes carpets free of duty. You have a chance to do that. I shall offer that as a substitute. There is no chance for any jokers in that bill. Everything appears on the surface. There are no compensatory duties that are multiplied. It is simply figured out according to the amount of scoured wool used in making the article. There is no excuse for you. You profess that you want to reduce this schedule. I am showing you how you can do it. Do not be obstinate, do not follow this man who was hired to destroy the Tariff Board and the Tariff Board's report. Do not be reckless and drive the sheep out of this country and shut up the mills. You have professed in a number of platforms that you would not do that, and even the chairman says that he is not going to harm any business interests by all his juggling with the tariff. Make him live up to his profession.

Vote for my motion and send this bill over to the Senate. The Senate will concur in it if you do. You can help us reform this schedule in less than 30 days. What drops of blood you have been sweating because the tariff revision was put off, as you state, almost a year. It is six months. You want to put it off for another year now. Do you dare take the responsibility? It is up to you. You are responsible. Vote for our bill, which is in accordance with the tariff report. That does not give any excessive duty on wool in any shape, raw or manufactured. It simply makes up the difference in the cost. The bill is worked out with infinite care. I know, because I was there. It is worked out according to the Tariff Board's report, which no man can gainsay, because it is fully fortified in every division of it. It simply follows out the facts which they have put upon the record. We have taken the costs as they have laid them down after this thorough care and investigation. Then, after the bill becomes a law, if the people do what you say they are going to do, you can rip things after the 4th of March, 1913. You know, you say you are going to have power, and I do not know but some of you believe it. It is a long road. If you win, you will then have a chance. This is not the end of tariff legislation, but this bill that I offer does reduce the rate; it reduces it 40 per cent.

According to your ideas it takes 40 per cent of burden off the shoulders of the people. We do not agree with you on that “burden,” but that is your idea. What excuse is there for your not voting for my bill? You have no excuse for bringing in a bill for a 20 per cent duty on wool. The revenues do not need it. The revenue from wool and manufactures of wool last year was \$28,982,552.58. To offset any loss of revenue on our bill, we shall have more than \$37,000,000 surplus. We are all right.

Why do you not do it? Why do you not vote for it? What excuse have you to offer why you should not do it? Get some credit from the country for passing good legislation. Good Lord, when you look over the record that you have made since you have been in power we know that you need some. Get some credit for it. Reform this wool schedule.

You can not criticize this bill as having excessive duties. Vote for it. Put it on the statute books and we will have lower duties on wool during the coming winter anyway, and then if the people are foolish enough to give you the power you can reduce the duties just as low as you want to; and the more you reduce them, the more you cut and slash, the more you hire your "experts" like Willis to write a report, the more bills of this kind you bring in, the sooner the country will turn you out and put us in and keep us there for another 20 years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN rose. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for one hour.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, Abraham Lincoln once said: I rejoice that I live to-day, because I am wiser than I was yesterday.

I do not know whether the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who has just taken his seat, and his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee of this House rejoice that they live to-day to see the Democratic majority adopt a real, honest revision of the tariff downward, but I am pretty certain that they are a little wiser to-day than they were when they passed the Payne-Aldrich Act. I recall that, according to them, that act was the best tariff act that was ever put upon the statute books, and now the very author of that act comes in here after two years of its operation and tells the House and the country that it was so iniquitous, so unjust, so outrageous that he and his colleagues on the committee and in the House have brought in a bill correcting those iniquities and injustices. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want this House and the country to understand that the Democratic majority here is not responsible for this continued agitation of the tariff. I do not know what place history will assign the distinguished occupant of the White House, but it must record him as the most persistent and conspicuous agitator of the tariff of any man in our country who ever touched public life. In his message to Congress on December 7, 1909, he used these words:

Nothing halts business and interferes with the course of prosperity so much as the threatened revision of the tariff.

The President who uttered in solemn proclamation these words has agitated and made the country and Congress agitate the tariff during every single session of Congress since he has been President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And his term, when it ends, by his calling two extra sessions, shall have had more sessions than that of any other President.

He had not been in office 30 days before he made his first call for an extra session to agitate tariff by repealing the Dingley Act, to "halt business and interfere with the course of the prosperity" of our country. In the next regular session he demanded a tariff commission to help him agitate tariff scientifically. Again, at the next session, he agitated tariff and reciprocity, to "halt business and interfere with the prosperity" of the country. In 30 days after its adjournment he called another extra session of the Congress, after the Democrats had secured control of the House, to renew his agitation of the tariff and reciprocity. Then, when we tried to help this President carry out the pledge he and we had made to the people in the campaign and give them an honest revision of the tariff downward, he vetoed every bill that we sent to him in consummation of that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In these veto messages he reminded us and the country that he was not done with agitation of the tariff and halting business; that he intended at the succeeding session—this session—to send in a message agitating, and directing Congress to agitate, the tariff again. And so he did. When we met in December in came his message agitating the tariff, "halting business," "interfering with prosperity." And now, when we, by the Underwood bill, attempt to fulfill the pledge that we made to the country, fulfill the pledge that the people understood Mr. Taft made in his campaign speeches in 1908, for an honest revision of Schedule K downward, not in the interest of the manufacturers, but in the interest of a failing Treasury and a consuming public, he and the Republican minority here are fighting the bill and propose to offer as a substitute a bill which they themselves confess is not in keeping with their promises, which my friend from Connecticut Mr. HILL, who wrote every line of it, practically admitted in the opening speech for the minority would not relieve the people of this country one penny, but it would take over \$4,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury, which is

now suffering by Republican extravagance a deficit of over \$14,000,000, and put it in the pockets of the protected sheep barons and manufacturers of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Still, not satisfied with this persistent, senseless agitation of the tariff, he asks us to appropriate \$60,000 more for his Tariff Board, so that at the next and last session of his term he can again agitate the tariff, "halt the business," and "interfere with the prosperity" of the country. Mr. Chairman, I challenge any man on this floor to point out one sentence, one line, one word in a single speech made by the Republicans on this floor in favor of their proposed substitute in which they declare that it will bring one penny of relief to the people of this country. If you will show to me, Mr. HILL, Mr. LONGWORTH, Mr. PAYNE, one single line in all of your speeches defending your bill, in which you give either the Treasury or the people, suffering under the extortions and iniquities of the Aldrich-Payne Act, the faintest hope that they will get one penny of relief, I will do the meanest thing I have ever done since I have been a Member of Congress, I will vote for your old sham revision bill. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] Ah, but they say the Underwood bill is not in conformity with the findings of the Tariff Board. Whence and why this great cry for the Tariff Board. For more than 100 years tariff measures have been written, without a suggestion of the need of a Tariff Board. For 50 years you Republicans have written the tariff laws of the country, with never a complaint of the lack of information, with never a demand for a Tariff Board. You wrote the Morrill Act, the McKinley Act, the Dingley Act, increasing the duties with each successive act, all without the aid of a Tariff Board. With the advent of the Taft administration, pledged by campaign promises to a real, honest revision downward, you came in extra session in 1909, and without the aid of or demand for a Tariff Board put upon the statute books the Aldrich-Payne Act.

Mr. Chairman, when for nearly a half a century, decade after decade, and Congress after Congress, our opponents were piling higher and heavier the tariff taxes and burdens on the backs of the millions of American people they needed no Tariff Board, but when the free, patriotic electorate of our country, awakened to the iniquities and inequalities of the Aldrich-Payne Act and aroused against legislative robbery under the guise of protection, by the election of 1910 commissioned this Congress to reduce these taxes and remove these burdens, from that moment to this, from the throat of every standpat Republican and every tariff-enriched baron throughout the country, went up the cry of "Tariff Board! Tariff Board!" [Applause on the Democratic side.] They needed no Tariff Board to increase the tariff burdens, and we need none to remove them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Shall we wait, shall we make the people wait, for a board appointed by a President who declared the Aldrich-Payne Act the best tariff law ever enacted, to find facts to convince us that a tariff tax on the class of the woolen cloths, woolen underwear, woolen blankets, which more than four-fifths of our people buy and must have, ranging from 75 per cent to 100 per cent, is wrong and should be reduced?

Shall we wait, shall we make the people, in these hungry days of the high cost of living, wait until the President's board find facts to convince us that a tariff tax of 4 cents a pound on bacon and hams and 25 per cent on flour, kept on by the President and his party since 1909, at the demand of the big packers and flour mills is a cruel outrage? If the sham revision bill proposed by the minority for the pending measure is written, as its authors claim, "in exact accordance with the report of the Tariff Board," and should become a law, how long shall we make the people wait for this board to reverse itself and find facts to convince us that a tax of from 72 per cent to 95 per cent, which this substitute levies on the clothes, flannels, and blankets of the poor and needy, is unjust and inhuman?

Every man in this country knows that neither the President nor the Republican Party wanted a tariff board to give them information as to how to honestly revise the tariff downward in the interest of the consumer. Every man of sense knows that they wanted some board, some tribunal, that had the appearance of disinterested impartiality to stand as a buffer, as a shield, between them and their high prohibitive protection substitute.

Let me call the attention of the House and the country to a portion of the President's message of last August vetoing the wool bill:

I was elected to the Presidency as the candidate of a party which in its platform declared its aim and purpose to be to maintain a protective tariff by "the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries."

Why did you eliminate the guaranty of "reasonable profits" in your report? Why did you fail to refer to it in your speeches? You did not have the courage to proclaim it publicly in your report and speeches, but you had the cunning to secure it in your substitute bill. This, gentlemen, was the main point that the President emphasized in his message—the guaranty of "a reasonable profit" to the trusts and manufacturers. I read further:

I have always regarded this language as fixing the proper measure of protection at the ascertained difference between the cost of production at home and that abroad, and have construed the reference to the profit of American industries as intended, not to add a new element to the measure stated or to exclude from the cost of production abroad the element of a manufacturer's or producer's profit, but only to emphasize the importance of including in the American cost a manufacturer's or producer's profit reasonable according to the American standard.

Who fixes these standards? The Havemeyers, of the Sugar Trust; the Armours and the Swifts, of the Meat Trust; the Whitman and Woods, of the American Woolen Co.; the Garys, of the Steel Trust, fix the standard of the manufacturer's or producer's profits, reaching all the way from 20 and 30 and 50 and sometimes 100 per cent per annum.

Mr. Taft, by solemn message to Congress, pledges the trusts and manufacturers that as long as he is President no tariff bill shall become law that does not guarantee to them a profit in accordance with the standard fixed by them. This substitute bill makes the same guaranty.

If we must have a Tariff Board to help carry out the Republican platform and this last pledge of Mr. Taft, why not have a practical one—a board that knows what the American standard of profit is and how to maintain and guarantee by law that standard? Why not have a board composed of the Havemeyers, the Garys, the Armours, the Whitmans, and Woods. They would be the best and most practical experts to carry out the Republican platform under the President's direction. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, they tell us that they want a Tariff Board in order to take the tariff out of politics. Nobody ever heard the Republican Party talking about taking the tariff out of politics until the intelligence and patriotism of the American people in 1910 took it out of Congress [applause on the Democratic side] and determined to take it out of the White House in 1912. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say to you gentlemen you will never take the tariff out of politics as long as the Republican Party is determined to serve the trusts and manufacturers and let them write the tariff laws of this country to enable them to plunder the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Never since 1816 has the tariff been taken out of politics except in 1846, when the Democracy of the Nation, here in this Capitol, had the patriotism and courage to enact, in the face of the prophecies of ruin and disaster made by the manufacturers, the Walker Act. In spite of the appeals and threats and bullyings of the special interests, whose agents had gathered here from every quarter of the country, it dared to write into the law the principle that a tariff tax should be levied only for the purpose of revenue for the Government with the least burden to the people. Under its beneficent operation the country prospered as never before or since. In the decade following manufacturing interests doubled and the wealth of the country more than doubled, marking the greatest increase in the history of our Government. The people were happy and contented. Tariff agitation ceased, and in less than 12 years there was not a protection tariff champion either in the Senate or in the House. Senator Clement Clay, of Alabama, in a speech in the Senate advocating repeal of the fishing bounties, made this observation:

The doctrine of protection is exploded and is without a party in the country or an advocate in either branch of Congress.

Gentlemen, we are not going to let you take the tariff out of politics until a law is again written upon the statute books that every dollar that is levied under the tariff shall be levied for the purposes of the Government only, and not a dollar shall be exacted from the people for the manufacturer's tribute. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The President says, "We must follow the Tariff Board." The Republican Party echoes, "We must follow the Tariff Board." Let me ask, When did the Tariff Board become sacred and infallible and inviolable? I charge that the President himself repudiates and spits upon the findings of his Tariff Board whenever it suits his purposes. He has discredited and repudiated it by his solemn act and deliberate declaration. Did not the Tariff Board report against free wood pulp and print paper, and declare that the difference between the cost here and the cost in Canada of print paper was \$5 a ton? And did not the President come to a Republican Senate and a Democratic House last summer and demand that wood pulp and

print paper be put upon the free list, in direct conflict with his Tariff Board's finding? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Did not this Tariff Board report that the difference between the price of grain products, especially wheat and barley, in America and in Canada was 10 cents a bushel? And did not the President ask you and us to repudiate that finding and to put grain on the free list? [Applause on the Democratic side.] He made a speech on July 4, in Indianapolis, after that report of the Tariff Board was published, after he had carefully read it, which speech was published as a Senate document, and in that speech he declared in the very face of the board's findings that there was no difference; that the prices of both our wheat and Canadian wheat were fixed alike by the markets of the world and were unaffected by the tariff? Candor compels me to say, however, that in my opinion the President was right and the board was wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to enter into lengthy criticism of the Tariff Board's report on Schedule K, because I have not the time. I could stand here all the afternoon and show its absurdities and its inconsistencies. Yet the Tariff Board was not so much to blame. This board is the creature of the President. It acts under his direction. He did not order this board to investigate the relation of the tariff to prices, the relation of the tariff to the revenues of the Government, the relation of the tariff to the consuming public. He did not tell them to go out to the woolen mills and see what enormous profits they were making what dividends they were paying, how much watered stock they had issued, how much reduction of the tariff they could stand. He did not direct them to investigate labor conditions in the woolen mills and the relation of the tariff to such conditions. He confined them to the narrow, partisan limits of finding facts to justify Republican protection. He directed them, according to his message transmitting to Congress the report—

to investigate industrial conditions and costs of production at home and abroad, with a view to determining to what extent existing tariff rates actually exemplify the protective-tariff principle, viz, that duties should be made adequate, and only adequate, to equalize the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

He had explained in his previous message, vetoing the woolen bill, that the "difference in cost" should include the manufacturer's profit according to the American standard.

He told them to go out and find facts that would justify the the Republican protective tariff, and they did as they were directed to do. They wrote a brief in favor of a standpat Republican protective tariff.

Now, let me show you some of the absurdities and inconsistencies in this report of the board. Remember that this Tariff Board was demanded by protectionists. It was created by protectionists. Its members were appointed by a protectionist, the President, who declared that the Aldrich-Payne Act was the best tariff bill ever enacted. Its members, or a majority at least, are high protectionists. The experts that it employs are most of them Republican protectionists, and one is a retired woolen manufacturer: This is the man whose name the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] would not give the other day.

He doubtless knew him, and knew, too, that a retired woolen manufacturer from Massachusetts, a high protectionist, was in the employ of this Tariff Board to help them investigate and make a report which should justify and "exemplify the protective principle." This is the manufacturer, no doubt, to whom the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] referred when, during the speech of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], he asked—I am reading from the official reporter's notes:

Is it not a fact that in making these examinations the Government had two experts, one a practical manufacturer acquainted with the process of manufacture and the other a practical accountant?

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] replied: Absolutely.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

This nonpartisan Tariff Board, as President Taft had directed, sent out protectionist experts to find facts to sustain Republican protection on wool, and they did it with a vengeance. More than two-thirds of our annual production of wool is grown in the West. Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, and Oregon are the great wool-producing States. From these States come the loudest clamorers for high protective tariff on wool. From the State of Wyoming hails Senator WARREN, who, as the late Senator Dolliver said, "is the greatest shepherd since Abraham." He is a sky-wall protectionist. Wyoming is the greatest wool-producing State in the Union. With a population about half as large as that of my district, she produces more wool annually than all the 13 Southern States, with the great States of Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa thrown in. The millionaire sheep barons of Wyoming want protection on wool, and they want it mighty bad and mighty high. A reason for maintaining the present high protection and an excuse to increase it, if possible,

must be given by some disinterested, impartial tribunal. Now comes this "nonpartisan," infallible, President's Tariff Board and deliberately finds and solemnly proclaims, in the report, on page 330, that, according to its method of calculation, in Wyoming it costs 12.4 cents per pound to produce wool, while in the State of Washington it costs less than one-twentieth of a cent. Think of such an absurdity—that it costs over two hundred and forty times more to produce a pound of wool in the great wool-producing State of Wyoming than in the State of Washington.

It finds that it costs in the woolgrowing State of Idaho 17.3 cents per pound, while in Nevada only 4.1 cents. Four times more in Idaho than in Nevada and three hundred and forty times more than in Washington.

Let us take the other two great wool-producing States of the West, Montana and Oregon. In Montana the board finds that its costs twice as much to produce a pound of wool as in California, three times as much as in Nevada, and two hundred and sixty times as much as in Washington.

In Oregon they find that it costs two and a half times as much as in Nevada and two hundred times as much as in Washington.

O Mr. Chairman, how can the millionaire tariff mendicants of these four woolgrowing States survive without high protection? But what else does the President's nonpartisan, infallible board find? They report, pages 11 and 330, that in Wyoming, the largest wool-producing State in the Union, in the State of the world's biggest flockmasters, in the State where woolgrowing has for years been considered and lauded as a great money-making industry, the sheep barons, exclusive of the loss of the capital invested in lands for the industry, make on the capital invested in the sheep and wool industry a gross profit of only the pitiful sum of 4 per cent. Deducting the lost interest on capital invested in land, it would be less than 3 per cent.

In Montana, a State that stands second in wool production, they make, according to the report, exclusive of the loss of interest on capital invested in lands, only 5.6 per cent; in Oregon, 4.7 per cent; and in the State of Idaho, the State of Senator HEYBURN, the great tariff standpatter of the West, not counting the loss of interest on capital invested in land, the big shepherds made only eight-tenths of 1 per cent in these high days of Republican prosperity under the Aldrich-Payne Act. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, gentlemen, there is not a man outside of the insane asylum who does not know—even a Republican ought to have sense enough to know—that these findings are ridiculous absurdities and that the Tariff Board was imposed upon by the big protection flockmasters of the West. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

What else? They find that in the 11 States of the West that produce two-thirds of the wool in the whole country, not deducting the loss of interest on capital invested in lands, the woolgrowers on the capital invested in the industry made, on a general average, only 6½ per cent gross profit. Gentlemen, these absurd findings and figures are enough to discredit, in the estimation of any intelligent man, the findings of this "nonpartisan" board.

You know, and I know, that under a protective tariff of 11 cents a pound on wool that they would make more in Oregon than 4 per cent, more in Idaho than eight-tenths of a cent, more in Wyoming than 4 per cent, more in Montana than 5 per cent, and more in the great West than 6.2 cents gross profits. And yet, in the face of these findings, you stand here and ask us to treat sacredly this Tariff Board report. Touch it not, handle it gently. There is not an honest man among you that believes there is one single word of truth in these calculations it makes. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Let me quote from page 11 of the report:

In western United States the capitalization per head of sheep (exclusive of land) is \$5.30, upon which a gross product of 6.2 per cent was realized during the 12 months under review.

And then adds:

The interest rate in that region ranges from 8 to 10 per cent per annum.

Why, then, do not the big flock masters sell out, loan their money out at 8 to 10 per cent and thereby make, certainly in Wyoming, Montana, Oregon, and Idaho, from 100 to 200 per cent more profit than they are now making in the sheep and wool industry? Does the board wish us to believe that the sheep barons of the West, like the Warrens and the Smoots, are in the business only as philanthropists and patriots, serving the country and the people by maintaining, at a loss, a needed American industry? The truth is, Mr. Chairman, the big, influential tariff-begging shepherds of the West have imposed on that board just like the American Woolen Co., known as the Woolen Trust, and other representatives of the woolen association imposed upon it.

Let me call your attention further to the board's report. They say, on page 11, that in the United States the average cost of a pound of wool is 9½ cents; in South America, between 4 and 5 cents; and in Australia, the largest competitor we have, from which the largest portion of our high-grade wool comes, the very country they ought to have carefully investigated, they do not know, they could not find out, but believe it is "materially lower than in South America." They could not find out the cost of production in Australia—our greatest competitor—but they could find the cost in South America, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, and Oregon. They leave it to my friend HILL and his colleagues on the committee to guess at it, so that they could put the tariff on wool just as high as the Woolgrowers' Association demand. To show another evidence of the board's ridiculous inconsistency, turn to page 343. Though on page 11 they state that the production of wool in South America costs from 4 to 5 cents per pound, and materially lower in Australia, more than 50 per cent lower than in the United States, on page 343 they say that "in Australia the average price per pound net to the grower is 18 cents," and "in South America 17 cents," while in the United States it is only 16 cents. And yet these gentlemen come in with their substitute and put a tariff of 18 cents per pound on the clean contents, which is over 9 cents per pound in the grease, to protect us against Australia and South America, when the Tariff Board report here shows that Australian wool ought to have 2 cents a pound and South American wool 1 cent a pound protection against us. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just one question?

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman is right quick about it I will. Since he lives in Wyoming, in such a poor sheep and wool growing State, and where the flockmasters make so little money and are so impoverished, I am going to yield to him out of charity. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to say that no one believed the figures of the Tariff Board as to the returns in the Mountain States on sheep growing, and of course I did not want that statement to go unchallenged—

Mr. KITCHIN. Go ahead and ask your question.

Mr. MONDELL. Because I simply wanted to say that, so far as I am concerned—and I know something about it—I think those figures are substantially correct, and since this Democratic Congress came in we have not been making that much.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let us see. I am going to show you either how credulous you are or with what little intelligence you represent the wool industry of Wyoming. As an honest man, do you believe that the board is right in finding that it costs in your State 12.4 cents a pound to produce wool and in the State of Washington it costs less than one-twentieth of 1 cent a pound, or 240 times as much in your State as in Washington? As an honest man, do you believe that? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand, but I have known something about the wool business in Wyoming for a great many years, and I have never believed that you could grow wool in Wyoming for less than about 15 to 16 cents a pound—that is, the class of wool that we grow.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then this Tariff Board again discredits the gentleman's intelligence on the subject of woolgrowing in his State, because they say that Wyoming raises it for 12.4 cents a pound. Evidently the gentleman does not know what he is talking about if the Tariff Board is correct. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

If any honest man outside the insane asylum will put his hand on his conscience and say, "I believe that the woolgrowers of the State of Washington can produce wool for less than one-twentieth of 1 cent a pound, while in the great wool-producing State of Wyoming it costs over 12 cents a pound," then I say that he ought either to be in the asylum or in the Republican Party. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state on what page of the Tariff Board's report he finds that statement of one-twentieth of 1 cent a pound?

Mr. KITCHIN. It is in the table on page 330.

Both Mr. HILL and Mr. LONGWORTH said in their speeches a few days ago and Mr. PAYNE this morning said that the bill which they propose to offer as a substitute for the Underwood bill is drawn in exact accordance with the findings of the Tariff Board. I challenge each one of these gentlemen to look at the report from beginning to end and find upon any page a single inference, a single intimation that you are justified in putting 18 cents a pound on the clean contents of wool, or 19 cents a pound scoured. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I recall the other day that my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] during

his speech said to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who was sitting in front of him, "I want your vote"—surely he does want the insurgent votes—"but I do not want your vote unless I tell you the truth. Read this quick, read it quick," and putting his finger on a certain page of the report asked Mr. NORRIS to read it as a justification for the 18 cents duty per pound.

Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not the slightest suggestion in that portion of the report he read that 18 cents was the proper rate. The Tariff Board was simply giving an illustration how to work out compensatory duties for the manufacturers, saying that, "for example," if you put a duty of 15 cents on scoured wool, the compensatory will be so much; if you put a duty of 16 cents a pound, it will be so much; and they ran up the illustrations to as high as 25 cents duty per pound, but they never recommended or suggested the rate you took.

They tell us and would have the consuming public to believe that they, by their proposed substitute, have reduced the tariff on the wools of classes 1 and 2, these being the finer grade wools, and given the sheep barons of the West less protection. Let no man be deceived by such assertions. I shall show you that this alleged reduction is only apparent and not real; that they provide in effect the same rate, the same protection which the Aldrich-Payne Act gives, and write into this bill the exact duty which the big wool interest demanded. Do my Republican friends know one Theodore Justice? Of course every Republican on the committee knows him. But for fear my Democratic colleagues and some Republicans in the House do not, I will introduce him. He is one of the rankest of high protectionists. For years he has been a star witness and adviser before the Republican Ways and Means Committee, representing the wool producing as well as the manufacturing interests. He appeared before the committee at its hearing in 1909 saying that he also "held a power of attorney to appear for the Woolgrowers' Association." He knows what the big shepherds want. He sent to each member of the Ways and Means Committee a statement, a copy of which I hold in my hands. It is dated December 22, 1911. He says:

The President hints at an average duty of 20 cents a scoured pound on wools of the first and second class. This would, in fact, be an increase on the present duty rather than a decrease. * * * Growers would be delighted if the duty upon all wool could be fixed at 20 cents scoured, for then they would have more protection than they have at present.

He then adds and proves that, considering the shrinkage of the wools imported for the last five years under the operation of the Aldrich-Payne Act, the duty actually paid per pound "is only 19 cents scoured." This would delight the big flockmasters. This is the rate Theodore Justice favored. This is the rate the big wool interests demanded and this is the rate fixed by the Republican substitute bill. Every minority member of the committee is intelligent enough to know that this substitute makes no practical reduction; that, considering the shrinkage of the wool imported for the last five years, the 18 cents per pound on the clean contents and 19 cents per pound on the scoured carried in the substitute, is exactly the rate which the imported wool of these two classes for the last five years actually paid under the Aldrich-Payne Act. The Tariff Board, on page 382, plainly demonstrates this. And yet they persist in asserting to the House and the country that they by their bill reduce the tariff on wool and the protection to the woolgrowers.

They tell us that they have in their substitute put wool of class 3, under the Aldrich-Payne Act—designated now in the substitute as class 2—known as carpet wool, on the free list. But where and how? Certainly no such provision can be found in their bill. But they say that they have practically put it on the free list by providing that if the wool is made into carpets, rugs, druggets, and the like, the manufacturer shall be allowed a rebate of the duty paid. This is true. The bill does contain a rebate clause, which in its operation gives to the manufacturer free of duty the wool that goes into the making of carpets, rugs, druggets, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I desire here to expose as infamous a piece of deception, inequality, and injustice as was ever concealed in the innocent and unsuspecting language of a bill. We recall that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who is reputed to be the author of the substitute, in the opening speech in favor of it, holding it aloft, declared with great glee, "Here is one tariff bill that contains no joker," and with an air of triumph challenged any Democrat to find one in it. I accept the challenge and assert with absolute assurance that the very section which the gentleman and his colleagues on the committee claim and assert puts wool of class 3 practically on the free list, actually increases the tariff on the wool that goes into the poor man's cloths and blankets over the Aldrich-Payne Act 75 per cent. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Last year 96,000,000 pounds of this wool were imported, many million pounds more than of wool of classes 1 and 2.

The Aldrich-Payne Act provides that this wool, if valued not more than 12 cents per pound, shall pay a duty of 4 cents per pound. Most of the 96,000,000 pounds imported in 1911 were valued at less than 12 cents and was therefore dutiable at 4 cents per pound. This is known as carpet wool, but millions of pounds go into the making of cheap clothes and cheap blankets. Now, this substitute, proposed by the Republican minority of the committee, on page 4, section 8, actually increases the duty on this wool from 4 cents to 7 cents per pound; that is, 75 per cent—"the duty shall be 7 cents per pound," says the bill—the highest duty ever put upon this class of wool. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] This so-called free-wool rebate clause, of which gentlemen seem so proud and boast so much, provides that if this wool is made into carpets, rugs, druggets, and so forth, for the rich and well to do the tariff of 4 cents per pound under the Payne Act is removed and no duty shall be paid; but if it is made into cheap cloths and cheap blankets which the poor must have and are only able to buy, a duty, increased from 4 cents over the Payne Act to 7 cents in the proposed substitute bill, must be paid. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, I challenge any Republican on the committee or in this House to give a single reason or excuse why any bill should contain such a miserable piece of deception and injustice as this. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You have increased the price of wool that goes into the poor man's cloths, blankets, and flannels from 4 cents to 7 cents and removed the duty of 4 cents on the wool which goes into the rich man's carpet, and neither by your report nor your speeches have you dared the slightest mention of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Somebody has imposed upon the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who wrote this bill, and imposed upon the Republican members of the committee who indorsed and reported it.

No patriotic progressive Republican who really wants to give the people relief by giving them cheaper cloths, cheaper flannels, and cheaper blankets can afford to vote for this substitute. I will not discredit the integrity of either the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] or any other member of the committee who reported this substitute, by charging that they were the real authors of the bill, and especially that joker provision. If they knew of this joker and its effect and did not disclose it to the House, they have not enough integrity for honest men to follow, and if they reported the bill without detecting it, they are too ignorant for intelligent men to follow. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That provision was inspired by some one in the interest of the millionairess sheep barons of the West, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZIEL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], minority members of the Ways and Means Committee, will do my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] like they did my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who put the joker in the lumber schedule of the tariff bill in 1909, they will have the gentleman coming in this afternoon and withdrawing this infamous joker. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] But they say that they have written their substitute in exact accordance with the Tariff Board's findings. I challenge any man on this floor to point out on what page of the Tariff Board's report, in all its 1,500 pages, is there a suggestion or intimation that the duty on wool of the third class should be increased. What else do they do by this joker provision? It loses, according to the purpose and statement of its authors, over \$4,000,000 revenue to the Federal Treasury. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and his colleagues boasted of the fact that the Government would no longer get revenue from this class of wool; that this wool was noncompetitive—it did not compete with our woolgrowers—that the tariff benefited none except the Government in securing revenue.

My friends, it has been my observation that nothing in this world makes a Republican madder than to see an honest dollar of taxes go where it properly belongs—into the Federal Treasury. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And nothing delights him more than to see it diverted from the Treasury and go where it does not belong—into the pocket of some tariff-fattened favorite. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] We know well enough why a rebate of duty was given; that is, free wool, if made into carpets. That was to help the carpet manufacturer and the rich who buy carpets. This is admitted by its authors. But why was the increase of 75 per cent made in the wools that went into the poor man's clothes and blankets? I will tell you. The sheep barons of the West demanded it, and up went the increase, ingeniously concealed in section 8 of the

substitute, and reference to which was adroitly withheld in the report and speeches of its authors.

The National Association of Woolen Manufacturers held a big banquet in this city at the New Willard in February, 1911. The chairman of the Tariff Board, my distinguished friend, ex-Speaker CANNON, and about 30 stand-pat Representatives and Senators were present. Senator WARREN, of Wyoming, the greatest flockmaster of the world, the most distinguished representative of the Woolgrowers' Association, was one of the star speakers. He opposed, in behalf of the flockmasters of the West, any reduction of the tariff on wools of the third class. He declared that these wools were used to make cheap clothes and cheap blankets and thereby came into competition with the wool of Wyoming and other Western States. The big shepherds of the West demanded that these foreign wools, out of which clothes and blankets are made, should be taxed out of our markets. In obedience to that demand the Republican members of the committee make this outrageous increase of from 4 to 7 cents per pound, this increase of 75 per cent, to enable these millionaire sheep barons of Wyoming and the West to exact larger tribute from the millions of poor men and women and children in this country, who need and are only able to buy the cheaper clothes and underwear and blankets. And they have the audacity to propose such a bill in the face of the horrible, appalling conditions of the working people developed at the recent hearings before the Rules Committee in regard to the Lawrence strike. Hundreds of boys and girls who worked in the woolen mills at Lawrence were thrown out of employment by the strike and out on the charities of the world. A lady, a trained nurse, was sent to Lawrence by some institution of charity to take some of these children to New York so that they could be properly cared for during the strike. She gathered up 119 of these little, cold, emaciated waifs, operatives in the big protected woolen mills, and out of these 119 little boys and girls, in the rigors of a Massachusetts climate, in the midst of one of the bitterest winters ever experienced, only 4 had undergarments on and 115 had not a thread of underwear about their little freezing bodies. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

It was further testified that only 20 of them had overcoats and the outer cloths were almost in rags. And this under a Republican protective-tariff system in the city of Lawrence, the high citadel of protection and the great center of wool manufacturing. The hypocrisy of the old Republican plea that protection is written and maintained in the name and in behalf of the workman is emphasized when we reflect that some of these boys and girls worked in mills that were daily manufacturing woolen underwear and clothes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I denounce it as a crime against humanity to increase, as this substitute proposes to do, in the interest of the sheep kings of Wyoming and the West, by 75 per cent, the tariff tax on the very kind of wool millions of the poor must have. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What else does this substitute do? On cheap clothes, dress goods, flannels, underwear, and blankets which more than 80 per cent of our people use, on the clothes, flannels, and blankets which those poor children of Lawrence should have, it levies a tariff tax of from 75 to 97 per cent, while on the fine clothes, underwear, and blankets which are used by the minority Members who wrote and presented this substitute it levies a tax of only 41 to 65 per cent. Mr. Chairman, the people of all parties, aroused against the iniquities of Schedule K of the Aldrich-Payne Act, have demanded a real, honest revision downward, a revision that will give relief to the consuming public. How do the Republicans answer this demand? They bring in a bill which its authors admit will not increase importations one dollar nor reduce prices to the consumer one penny. By their own admission it is a sham revision, with which to fool the people and at the same time to satisfy the wool and woolen interests. Mr. Chairman, I venture the opinion that no fair-minded man can study this proposed substitute without reaching the same conclusion as I have, that it is a masterpiece of false pretense, injustice, and inequality. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All general debate has closed on the bill. The Clerk will now read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That on and after the 1st day of January, 1913, the articles hereinafter enumerated, described, and provided for shall, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), be subjected to the duties hereinafter provided, and no others; that is to say:

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 3 to 9 and insert:

"That the act entitled 'An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved August 5, 1909, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of the paragraphs of Schedule K of section 1 of said act, from 360 to 395, inclusive of both, and inserting in place thereof the following:

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is a mere matter, in one sense, as to the form of the bill, but in other respects it goes to the merits of the proposition. When this bill was introduced under its old number at the special session of Congress last year I called the attention of gentlemen to the fact that as the bill was not, and did not purport to be, an amendment to the existing tariff law, if the bill were enacted it would repeal the maximum and minimum provisions of the law, as well as set aside the law relative to the treaty with Cuba. When the bill went into conference it was changed so that there was inserted in the bill in conference practically the provision which I have now offered.

When the metal-schedule bill was reported to the House at this session of Congress it was reported as an amendment to the existing tariff law and provided for striking out certain paragraphs in that law and inserting in lieu thereof the paragraphs in the bill. When the chemical-schedule bill was reported to the House it contained the same phraseology, and when the sugar-schedule bill was reported to the House it contained the same phraseology.

The amendment which I have offered is simply to provide that the provisions of this bill shall be in lieu of the provisions of the existing law, as an amendment to that law, by striking out the provisions in the law relating to Schedule K and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of this bill. That would save the maximum and minimum provisions of the law. It would save the treaty with Cuba, and it would save various other administrative features in the Payne tariff law which are contained in this, and would conform with the proposition which the Ways and Means Committee have adopted in their recent bill, since I called their attention to the matter, when they reported this bill in the first instance.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the other administrative features of the Payne bill do not affect Schedule K. It was not necessary to make this bill an amendment to the Payne bill in order to bring into it the administrative features of the act, nor does the treaty with Cuba seriously affect this bill either way, as there are no wool imports from or exports to Cuba that amount to anything. For that reason the bill as originally written was written as an independent bill, and there is no reason to change it.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the debate on this paragraph close. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 52, yeas 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. SHARP rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 12, page 1, strike out the word "twenty," and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, nearly a year ago, in the consideration of a bill identical with the one before us to-day, it was my pleasure and opportunity to offer an amendment exactly as I have offered this to-day.

I wish to say that it seems to me that that amendment was then, as now, justified. At that time, during the consideration of the bill in the House, no one seemed to know or could even hazard a guess as to what the Senate would do, but after much discussion and argument in that body and later between the conferees a bill was finally reported back which upon this item imposed a duty of 29 per cent.

It seemed to me that in a certain sense it was a rather puerile play, because it impressed me that neither side wanted

to make a concession that would be above or below a certain figure, so they stood out for their opinions a little too punctiliously, and made it 29 instead of 30 or 35 per cent. But be that as it may, the duty finally agreed upon was substantially the same as this amendment that I have offered.

The bill went to the President, and for the reasons which he afterwards stated in his veto message, he disapproved of that bill. Since then the Tariff Board, the lack of a report from which seemed to be the obstacle in the way of the President's approval, has made its report, and while I have not read entirely that report, I am fairly familiar with its provisions as they relate to raw wool more especially, and I still am of the belief that a 30 per cent duty would be wiser, more equitable, and more just than a 20 per cent duty.

Indeed, it is a matter of regret to me that this proposed legislation, as it concerns the duty on raw wool, is necessarily so connected in the bill that the much needed reforms in the way of reductions on the manufactured goods included in this schedule, and I believe in the main justly provided for, can not be secured without being compelled to vote for the measure in its entirety upon its final passage in the House. However, this fact should not deter any Member, regardless of his party affiliations, from expressing his views upon any portion of the bill or endeavoring, by amendments, to correct any inequalities which in his judgment lie against the bill. It is because I believe that, in this particular duty as it applies to raw wool, a substantial gain can be made in the revenues of our Government, as well as a more just consideration given to our wool-growers, I have made this amendment in good faith.

I listened with much interest to what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] stated on the floor a while ago, and I observed that whereas much of his argument was based upon the fact, as he claims, that there is a trust, amounting to a monopoly, in the control of western wool, yet let me say for the Ohio woolgrowers that such is far from the fact. We have in Ohio to-day, I think, something like 4,000,000 or 4,500,000 sheep. They are divided into small flocks, averaging from 75 to 100, and I suppose there are from 40,000 to 50,000 sheep-growers in the State.

I wish to say in their praise that I am in hearty accord with all that my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] said in his speech of last Saturday night as to the benefits that the Ohio woolgrowers have conferred upon that great industry in the United States, because they have placed their products at the very top of perfection and excellency; and I feel to-day that the woolgrowers of this country are engaged in an industry that is basic in its importance, not only as furnishing clothing for our people, but also food products; and in this latter capacity, as a food supply, it is in active competition with the so-called Beef Trust.

It seems to me from the point of revenue that this bill, in so far as this particular duty is concerned, unnecessarily results in a loss amounting to several millions of dollars annually.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KENDALL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to the gentleman proceeding for five minutes, but I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman can close debate at any time. As I understand it, there is no disposition to delay. I think the gentleman had better wait a while and let it run a little longer.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that this is the raw-wool proposition, and there will probably be more debate upon that than upon any other paragraph of the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in five minutes, and that the gentleman from Ohio have the five minutes he wants.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate close on this amendment at the end of five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHARP. My time is very limited.

Mr. TOWNER. My question is entirely a friendly one.

Mr. SHARP. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. TOWNER. I should like to know whether the gentleman would not consent that the figures be placed at 29 cents instead of 30?

Mr. SHARP. I am willing to consent to anything that will in a measure do justice to my constituents, whose interests I am trying to fairly represent here to-day.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman consent that his amendment read 29 cents instead of 30 cents?

Mr. SHARP. I am perfectly willing to have that.

Mr. MANN. We can not consent.

Mr. SHARP. I will cite the estimate made in the report of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, which places the amount of imports for the ensuing year at practically \$66,000,000 under a duty of 20 per cent.

In looking back over the amount of imports in the year 1910 I find that under the higher and existing tariff there were, in round figures, but \$47,000,000 worth, and in 1911, \$29,572,000 worth. It must follow, necessarily, that if the estimate in this tabulated statement here is correct, then in order to reach this great sum of \$66,000,000, which is nearly 50 per cent higher than it was in 1910 under the Payne tariff law, we must get a very largely increased amount of our wool from other countries. If that is true, we must of necessity get a very much smaller supply from our own sheep raisers in this country. That proposition would seem to follow of necessity, else we would find that we must have in prospect the wearing of two suits of clothes where we now wear one. I can not but believe that the anticipated revenues to come from this source, as estimated in the report, are too high.

There is one other argument I wish briefly to present, and that is that our sheep raisers are not exporters of wool. We import all that we use in excess of our home production. Several planks in our Democratic national platform have, in substance, reiterated from time to time that we were in favor of free trade where a trust controls the manufactured articles or where the articles manufactured here are sold in foreign countries at a less price than they are sold at home. But it certainly is not begging the question and it is not in violation of that platform that I am advocating a duty still reducing the present rate by fully 30 per cent instead of a more radical reduction amounting to 55 to 60 per cent. It is my earnest hope that though denied in this House, yet by the time this bill comes back from the Senate we will have at least such a duty as equals that in the bill passed at the former session of this Congress. And I want, by way of prophecy, to say that it occurs to me now that the only thing that will prevent a substantial agreement between the conferees of the two Houses will be the question whether the duties shall be specific or ad valorem. I must confess I do not understand the practical working out of these two methods in accurately determining the dutiable status of raw wool sufficiently for me to decide which would be the best plan. It seems to me that both of them have holes in them, so to speak—both of them have defects—but as far as my examination of the subject has gone it appears to me that it might be more satisfactory to have a specific duty levied upon the pound of wool rather than an ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP].

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. SHARP)—ayes 44, noes 56.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out lines 10 to 13, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"1. All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals shall be divided, for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon, into the two following classes:

"2. Class 1, that is to say, merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools, or other wools of merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including Bagdad wool, China lamb's wool, Castel Branco, Adrianople skin wool or butcher's wool, and such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Aires, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, Egypt, Morocco, and elsewhere, and Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used, and all wools not hereinafter included in class 2, and also the hair of the camel, Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals.

"3. Class 2, that is to say, Donskol, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, Russian camel's hair, and all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Syria, and elsewhere, excepting improved wools hereinafter provided for.

"4. The standard samples of all wools, which are now or may be hereafter deposited in the principal customhouses of the United States, under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be the standards for the classification of wools under this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to renew these standards and to make such additions to them from time to time as may be required, and he shall cause to be deposited like standards in other customhouses of the United States when they may be needed.

"5. Whenever wools of class 2 shall have been improved by the admixture of merino or English blood, from their present character, as represented by the standard samples now or hereafter to be deposited in the principal customhouses of the United States, such improved wools shall be classified for duty as class 1.

"6. If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act, invoiced or entered as of class 2, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable as of class 2, shall contain any wool or hair subject to the rate of duty of class 1, the whole bale or package shall be subject to the rate of duty chargeable on wool of class 1; and if any bale or package be claimed by the importer to be shoddy, mungo, flocks, wool, hair, or other material of any class specified in this act, and such bale contain any admixture of any one or more of said materials, or of any other material, the whole bale or package shall be subject to duty at the highest rate imposed upon any article in said bale or package.

"7. The duty on all wools and hair of class 1, if imported in the grease, shall be laid upon the basis of its clean content. The clean content shall be determined by scouring tests which shall be made according to regulations which the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. The duty on all wools and hair of class 1 imported in the grease shall be 18 cents per pound on the clean content, as defined above. If imported scoured, the duty shall be 20 cents per pound.

"8. The duty on all wools of class 2, including camel's hair of class 2, imported in their natural condition, shall be 7 cents per pound. If scoured, 19 cents per pound: *Provided*, That on consumption of wools of class 2, including camel's hair, in the manufacture of carpets, druggets and bookings, printed, colored, or otherwise, mats, rugs for floors, screens, covers, hassocks, bedslides, art squares, and portions of carpets or carpeting hereafter manufactured or produced in the United States in whole or in part from wools of class 2, including camel's hair, upon which duties have been paid, there shall be allowed to the manufacturer or producer of such articles a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid less 1 per cent of such duties on the amount of the wools of class 2, including camel's hair of class 2, contained therein; such drawback shall be paid under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in brief, is to substitute the language of the minority members of the committee down to and including paragraph 8, page 4, of the bill that they have framed, with the exception of one amendment on page 4, to wit, striking out the word "nineteen," in line 8, and substituting the word "twenty."

Mr. Chairman, I am gratified with the report of the Tariff Board upon the matters that I deem are of vital importance in connection with shaping a wool-tariff bill. Nearly a year ago in this House I offered an amendment to the bill, similar to the pending one, which was pending at that time, in which I sought to provide a tariff that would recognize scoured wool as the true basis for a duty; and also that would recognize the principle of a specific duty instead of that of an ad valorem duty.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to me that the Tariff Board, after very careful inquiry made by that board into the whole subject, has come out squarely in favor of both propositions—in favor of a duty on scoured wool, and in favor of a specific duty. The necessity for a specific duty is to give protection to our producers when protection may be needed. The ad valorem duty fails in that particular because it gives highest protection when it is not needed and denies protection when it is needed.

There is one modification, however, that I have made in this amendment from the amendment that I offered a year ago, and that is this: At that time I offered an amendment placing a duty of 25 cents per pound upon the scoured wool, and I have now used the language of the bill prepared by the minority members in placing 18 cents on the clean content, but 20 cents on a pound if imported scoured. In other words, I have reduced the amount in the amendment that I offered a year ago from 25 cents to between 5 and 7 cents per pound. At that time I recognized, as did others in this House, the necessity for a modification of Schedule K. At that time, even without waiting for the report of the Tariff Board, I was willing to help in framing a law that would meet the conditions. I went so far that I brought down on my own head criticism of those interested in the industry, but I believed I was right then, and I believe now I was right then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. With that earnest desire on my part, I voted for the amendment that I proposed. It is needless to say that it did not become a part of the bill as finally passed by this body. To further emphasize my earnestness in a desire to bring about a reasonable modification of Schedule K I voted

with the majority Members of this body and helped send the Underwood bill to the Senate, hoping that in some way the two Houses, in considering that question, might get together upon a bill that would relieve the situation, correct the evils in the present law, and bring about a condition that would be satisfactory to the people of this country. We all know the result, that the bill as finally passed did not meet the Executive approval, and we are again considering the question, but with the additional light that the Tariff Board has furnished.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FRENCH. I will.

Mr. WILLIS. What rates are provided for in the amendment offered by the gentleman?

Mr. FRENCH. The language of the bill introduced by the minority of the committee with the rate of 18 cents on the clean content and 20 cents a pound on the imported and scoured wool. I will say that the last figure is my own, raising the figures from 19, as in the minority bill, to 20 cents per pound.

Mr. WILLIS. And that is the only change?

Mr. FRENCH. That is the only change. This House approaches the subject with more opportunity for wisdom than it did a year ago. We have the report of the Tariff Board, which has given to this country more information and better information upon this question than was ever assembled by any body hitherto.

We are now able to consider the question upon that information which we have in our possession. I recognize that my amendment of a year ago was abundantly safe, so far as the wool producers were concerned, and now as the result of the study that the board has made I am willing to say that it was higher than probably the Tariff Board's report will sustain.

I want to suggest to the majority Members of this body that you are facing a condition that we all recognize should be relieved. You say that Schedule K is wrong. I say that it is wrong. You know what happened to the bill that was passed by this Congress a year ago. As I emphasized my earnestness then in joining with you to send your bill to the Senate, there to receive the consideration of that body, I want to ask the majority Members of this body if they are in deep earnestness and not playing politics to stand on the report of the Tariff Board, which board they supported in a preceding Congress, and send a bill to the Senate that the Senate will pass and the President will approve. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move a pro forma amendment to strike out the last word. In five minutes I can not in detail criticize the bill reported by the majority committee or the one recommended by the minority. Frankly, in my opinion neither proposition has received that attention which it ought to command and would command if it were supposed for a holy minute that legislation touching Schedule K were really going to be enacted.

Much has been said about the Tariff Board. A report from any source of knowledge is always apt. I believe, in this instance, the report to be a valuable one, being based on a careful investigation of the facts, and if I could have my way about it I would have the committee take into account these facts, together with all other information gained by diligent inquiry, and consider the same in framing a bill; but the report of the Tariff Board has been ignored.

I do not approve of the bill proposed by the majority. It was framed for purposes of political capital and without proper consideration. It was begotten in secrecy and delivered by force of a caucus. I think it will never prove a viable child, and I hope it will not. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Underwood] who reported this bill differs radically from myself. He is not in favor of the principle of protection. I am for protection for every American industry—protection high enough, broad enough, and upon so firm a foundation that it will really protect every American industry.

It was my fortune a few months ago to visit the Yazoo section of the Mississippi River. I studied with some interest the levees. They have been raising them higher and higher, and they have been strengthening the banks with mattresses, because when time of trial comes a great broad stretch of country would be damaged by the great flood unless the levees were high enough and strong enough to confine the water to the channel. Any levee that does not meet the attack of the high water is of no account, just as any tariff bill professing to be a protective measure that does not shut out the cheaper products of the world affords no protection. [Applause on the Republican side.] This bill is not a protective measure, and does not profess to be. Oh, yes; it may involve "incidental protection" or something of that kind to catch votes.

Much has been said about the small wage paid to the factory hand in this country. It is not as high as we all would wish it might be. It is enough to insure better labor conditions in the United States than exist anywhere else on earth—so good that a million of the Caucasian race, from across the water, come here annually to avail themselves of the wage scale of the United States.

[The time of Mr. CANNON having expired, by unanimous consent he was granted five minutes more.]

The fact of the tremendous immigration to our shores answers all the speeches which have been made in criticism of labor conditions. Some may say that labor is oppressed in this country; but I ask, Why, then, does labor come to this country? Gentlemen may talk about the distress at Fall River, at San Francisco, New York, or any other portion of the country. Distress is with us always and has been from the beginning, but, after investigation, I have no hesitation in saying that there is less distress among the 90,000,000 people in the United States, on farm and in factory, than anywhere else on God's footstool. [Applause on the Republican side.] Some may argue that under Democratic tariff legislation labor will get the same wages for making a particular product and will buy other products made by labor at a less cost. Mr. Chairman, the American people are intelligent. They know that that is the cheapest kind of demagoguery and misstatement. The laborer making a particular product for a good wage can not expect to sell his product to another laborer unless that laborer also receives a good wage. And I truly state that wages received and prices paid for products consumed in the United States make our citizenship more comfortable than elsewhere in the world. New York, the great Empire State, is the greatest in production in the United States and in population. I asked my friend here from New York [Mr. MALBY] what evidence they had there of the well-being of the multitude—those who live in the sweat of their faces. He tells me that there are \$1,600,000,000 of the savings of the men who labor in the savings banks in New York and that there are nearly 3,000,000 depositors. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I am surprised to see gentlemen from the old North State and elsewhere south of Mason and Dixon's line opposing the protective principle. Thank God, under that policy of the Republican Party we have reached the stage that we have. In North Carolina, which furnishes us Representative KITCHIN, in Georgia, in South Carolina, and elsewhere throughout the South the quickening hand of protection is diversifying your industries. Oh, you weep crocodile tears about the duty on salt. Salt can be had at a dollar a barrel, which is less than you can transport it for 5 miles in a two-horse wagon. Duty on salt! Great Heavens! During the great contest for the Union there was a salt famine down South, and the cry was for salt, salt, salt. Yet God Almighty had deposited salt almost without limit in Louisiana and other sections of the southern country. You had never had but the one industry, however, and were hungry for salt. A new era arrived with the close of the Civil War. The American people in the South began to diversify their industries and are now beginning to reap the reward; but let me say to you that whatever becomes of this bill, whatever is the result of tariff agitation, if you could write your tariff policy on the statute books there would be insolvency and bankruptcy, and the people, having learned that kindergarten lesson, would come almost as one individual to demand the restoration of the policy of protection. Even Brother KITCHIN, if he should serve in Congress 20 years from now, and I should live to be 100 to serve with him—even he, with better-informed mind than he has now, I venture to say, would stand for the policy of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

One word more, Mr. Chairman, before the hammer falls. I shall vote for the motion to recommit the pending bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the bill suggested by the minority of that committee, for I am satisfied from a somewhat hurried examination of the two bills that the one suggested by the minority, from the standpoint of protection and the well-being of the country, is immeasurably superior to the pending measure.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to go on record on this bill. I shall have no other, as I have a pair with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. If he were here, he would vote for the majority bill. I would vote against it. If he were here, he would vote against the motion to recommit and report the bill prepared by the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means on data supplied by the Tariff Board. I would vote for that motion to recommit and to substitute that bill, because I regard it as right.

I am not a new convert to a tariff board or a tariff commission. I introduced a bill in this House in 1906 providing for the establishment of such a board. I was in favor of it then, and I am in favor of it now. I was a protectionist then, and I am a protectionist now, and while I have a desire to maintain the standard of our living I shall continue to be a protectionist. The tariff provided for in the bill prepared by the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means on information supplied by the Tariff Board measures the difference between the cost of producing wool and woollens in the United States and in competing countries. That is the policy announced in 25 Republican State platforms in 1910. It is the policy announced unqualifiedly by the Republican State platform in my own State. It is a policy that the leader of the Republican Party, President Taft, stands for to-day. Men of all parties now look upon this way of making a tariff law when they are not looking at it from a political standpoint. Everyone knows that this is the only safe way to deal with a tariff schedule that involves a great industry. We have progressed from the trade and barter method of making a tariff law. Every leader and every believer in the Republican Party is now in favor of revising the tariff one schedule at a time on information furnished by a tariff commission.

Col. Roosevelt announced day before yesterday his firm belief in protection for all our industries and for revision on information that enables Congress to prepare a law that takes into account conditions of competition, and make it sure that none of our industries will suffer. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; Mr. MCGILLICUDDY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions (S. Res. 271):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. ROBERT LOVE TAYLOR, late Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. TAYLOR.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect his remains be removed from Washington to Nashville, Tenn., for burial, in charge of the Sergeant at Arms, attended by the committee, who shall have full power to carry these resolutions into effect.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator the Senate do now adjourn.

And that, in compliance with the foregoing, the Vice President had appointed as said committee Mr. LEA, Mr. BACON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. BOURNE, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. PAGE, Mr. WATSON, and Mr. KERN.

THE WOOLEN SCHEDULE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. GRAY. About 10 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes and the gentleman be recognized for that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRAY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct my attention to this branch of the tariff question. I listened this morning to Mr. PAYNE's explanation of the great importance of this Tariff Board. The men who revised the tariff upward under a pledge to the people to revise it downward are now before us with a substitute bill and posing as zealous reformers seeking the true facts and unbiased advisement as the basis of tariff legislation they tell us that a tariff board is absolutely necessary to obtain reliable data. Then, why did they turn a deaf ear to the appeals made for a tariff board to them in the Sixtieth Congress, and refused even to allow a bill reported for the consideration of the House? Why did they vote down a tariff-board plank at their Chicago convention in 1908 and expunge it from their platform? Why did they pass the Payne law and report it out of this House without one word, one sentence, or one line to provide for a tariff board if a tariff board is absolutely necessary to obtain reliable tariff data? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And why did they reject every amendment offered in the Senate to the Payne bill to provide power to investigate the tariff and authority to obtain reliable tariff data? Why did

they reject the amendment offered in the Senate to the Payne bill to give this body the name and style of a tariff board instead of the meaningless term "such persons"? Why did they even object to calling it a tariff board? Why did they vote down this amendment? Why did they reject the amendment offered in the Senate to the Payne bill to make the members of this body independent appointees of the President instead of mere servile tools and dependent employees subject to the absolute dictation and control of one-man power? Why did they object to making this body an independent board? Why did they vote down this amendment if a tariff board is absolutely necessary to obtain reliable tariff data? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why did they reject the amendment offered in the Senate to the Payne law in these words:

And such persons shall have power to examine witnesses under oath and to compel the production of books and papers.

Why did they object to the examination of witnesses under oath? Why did they object to the production of books or papers? Why did they object to proceeding with even the common formality to observe truth and to guard against error if they are seeking the true facts and unbiased tariff advisement?

And why did the House conferees, led by Mr. PAYNE himself, refuse to concur in the only amendments which the Senate permitted to go into the Payne bill and which might have been construed to give power to investigate the tariff or authority to obtain reliable tariff data? Why did the House conferees, led by Mr. PAYNE himself, refuse to concur in the amendment which the Senate permitted to go into this bill in these words:

Such persons shall have power to make thorough investigations and examinations into the production, commerce, and trade of the United States and foreign countries, and all conditions affecting the same.

Why did they object to any investigation or any examination into either production or commerce or trade of the United States or of any foreign nation or of any condition affecting the same? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why did the House conferees, led by Mr. PAYNE himself, move to strike out these words? Why did they vote to strike them out, and why did they strike them out? [Applause on the Democratic side.] And why did the House conferees, led by Mr. PAYNE himself, also refuse to concur in the amendment which the Senate had permitted to go into the Payne bill in these words:

And information which will be useful to Congress in tariff legislation.

Why did they object to obtaining any information useful in tariff legislation? And why did the House conferees, led by PAYNE himself, move to strike out these words? Why did they vote to strike them out, and why did they strike them out [applause on the Democratic side], if they are in good faith seeking the true facts and unbiased advisement as the basis of tariff legislation, and if a tariff board is absolutely necessary to obtain reliable data? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And now, Mr. Chairman, they come before us with a body which they have refused even to allow called a tariff board or given a name expressive of the duties to be performed by a tariff commission, and the members of which they have refused to allow made the independent appointees of the President, to act as an independent board, instead of mere servile tools and dependent employees, subject to the absolute dictation and control of one-man power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the understanding was that debate on this paragraph should close in 10 minutes, and I ask the gentleman how much time he desires.

Mr. GRAY. I will close as soon as I answer the gentleman from New York in regard to this Tariff Board, and I do not believe it will take very long. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I will join in the request that the gentleman have five minutes additional.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, they come before us this morning with a body which they now call a Tariff Board, but which is without power to examine witnesses under oath, without power to compel the production of books or papers, without power to proceed with even the common formalities to observe truth or to guard against error, without power to make any investigation or any examination into either the production or trade or commerce

of the United States or of any foreign nation, or of any condition affecting same, and without power to obtain any information useful in tariff legislation, and which they have affirmatively denied any of the duties of a Tariff Board to perform, and thus stripped of every vestige of power to investigate the tariff and every semblance of authority to obtain reliable tariff data, and they tell us on the floor of this House this morning that they are in good faith seeking the true facts and unbiased advisement as the basis of tariff legislation, and that their Tariff Board is absolutely necessary to obtain reliable tariff data.

And thus, stripped and denuded of all legal sanction, force, and vitality, the provision which finally became a law as a part of the Payne bill, and which, it is claimed, authorizes and empowers the appointment of a tariff commission to investigate and report upon the tariff, and under which over half a million dollars has been expended in securing the voluntary statements of interested parties, not under oath, is as follows:

To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of his duties imposed upon him by this section and the officers of the Government in the administration of the custom laws the President is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

And, too, it must be understood that this provision is a part of section 2 of the Payne law, which relates wholly and exclusively to the maximum and minimum tariff rates established by that section, and in which all and the only duty imposed upon the President and with which he is charged is the duty of enforcing such rates against foreign nations accordingly as such nations may be found discriminating against American exports, and in which section there is not a word, line, or sentence in any way pertaining to or even the slightest suggestion of a Tariff Board to obtain data to form the basis of tariff legislation, as all amendments to provide for such authority had been deliberately rejected, voted down, and stricken out.

But it has been insisted here that notwithstanding all this they made an effort to provide for a real tariff board in the last session of the last Congress. Why did they not make their effort to provide for a tariff board before they revised the tariff upward in the last Congress? Why did they not make their efforts to provide for a tariff board before the people had voted them out of power during the last Congress? Why did they only make their efforts to provide for a tariff board after they had revised the tariff upward and the work of revision was over, and when they had an object and a purpose to remove the tariff from the reach of the new House in order to keep it where they had placed it without any report from a tariff board, and without any so-called special expert advisement?

Now, Mr. Chairman, they tell up also that the President wants to be sufficiently advised before he signs tariff bills. Let them explain to the people why it is that the President was sufficiently advised to sign a bill to revise the tariff upward without any report from a tariff board, but he was not sufficiently advised to sign a bill to revise the tariff downward upon the same identical articles without waiting for a report from a tariff board. [Applause.] Let them explain to the people how it is that the President was sufficiently advised to sign a bill to raise the tariff and increase the cost of the necessities of life to the people without a report from a tariff commission, but he was not sufficiently advised to sign a bill to lower the tariff and reduce the cost of the same necessities of life to the people without waiting for a report from a tariff commission. [Applause.]

I thank you, gentlemen, for your applause. Let them explain to the people also how it is that the President was sufficiently advised to sign a bill to place farm products from Canada on the free list in exchange for Canada opening her market to the American manufacturers without waiting for a report from a Tariff Board, but he was not sufficiently advised to sign a bill to place farm implements and farmers' supplies on the free list from Canada, or any other country, for the benefit of the American farmers without waiting for a report from a Tariff Board.

And let them also explain how it is that a Tariff Board is not needed while these men hold power to control tariff legislation, but becomes indispensable the very moment that they are out of power and others are given control of tariff legislation. [Applause.] Let them explain to the people how it is that a Tariff Board is opposed when the tariff is to be revised upward, but imperatively demanded when it is to be revised downward. [Applause.] And also let them explain to the people how it is that there is sufficient and ample data at hand to revise the tariff upward, but a total want of facts to revise it downward again.

For 17 years these men have held the House, the Senate, and the Executive; for 17 years they have dominated the full legislative control of this Government; for 17 years they have

contended that Congress was competent to pass upon tariff; for 17 years they have claimed that Congress was sufficiently advised and in possession of ample data for tariff revision; for 17 years they have held that the tariff was a fit subject for settlement in Congress; for 17 years they have frowned upon the Tariff Board experiment of 1882 as an unwarranted encroachment upon the power and jurisdiction of this House to initiate tariff legislation; for 17 years they have failed to recognize the now so-called great importance of a Tariff Board; for 17 years they have failed to recognize the now claimed great value of special expert tariff advisement. Now let them explain to the people how it is that they have come into the possession of more wisdom and tariff understanding the next day after they go out of power than they were able to acquire during all those 17 years; let them explain to the people how it is that they have groped their way in tariff darkness during all this time in which they held power only to come into this great flood of light the next day after they go out of power; let them explain to the people how it is that they have lived this life of shame and criminal ignorance only to be found kneeling about the altar of truth in the eleventh hour and on the very dawn of the day of judgment.

We have no report from any tariff board. We have no tariff board. We have no such legally constituted body. We have no board empowered to investigate the tariff. We have no board empowered to obtain reliable tariff data. We have no board empowered to examine witnesses under oath. We have no board empowered to compel the production of books or papers. We have no board empowered to proceed with even the common formalities to observe truth or to guard against error. We have no board empowered to make any investigation or any examination into either the production or commerce or trade of the United States, or of any foreign nation, or of any condition affecting the same. We have no board empowered to obtain any information useful in tariff legislation. All amendments providing for such power and authority were rejected, voted down, and struck out by the Senate Finance Committee, and the House conferees, led by PAYNE, and sustained by the House, the Senate, and the Executive.

All we have is a report of so-called facts from a few servile and dependent employees, subject to the will and direction of one-man power alone, prepared under the absolute dictation and control of the Executive only, and based upon the voluntary and ex-parte statements of the interested parties themselves, without even the sanctity of an oath to observe truth or to guard against error, and without any compulsory process to compel the production of books or papers for verification.

But they tell us that this board has discovered by its investigation that the woolen tariff is too high, and have recommended a reduction. The people had already found out for themselves that the wool tariff was too high, and had demanded a reduction. The Democratic caucus had already ascertained substantially the same facts, and had recommended substantially the same reduction upon a mere compromise and without an appropriation of over half a million of dollars to obtain the advice of interested parties.

This discovery that the woolen tariff is too high was made only after the people had declared their ultimatum for tariff revision, after a new House had been elected upon the issues of tariff reduction, after the revolt against the Payne law had threatened to dethrone the party in power, and after the necessity arose for a temporary change of base, in order to stay the tide of public opinion against the policy of high protection and to appease the wrath and indignation of the consuming public.

Gentlemen, I thank you for this generous extension of time you have given me to conclude my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois withdraw the pro forma motion?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I withdraw the amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the second section of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

2. On all nolls, top waste, card waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, bar waste, thread waste, garnetted waste, shoddies, mungo, flocks, wool extract, carbonized wool, carbonized nolls, and on all other wastes and on rags composed wholly or in part of wool, and not specially provided for in this act, the duty shall be 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all of lines 14 and 15, on page 1, and lines 1 to 5, inclusive, on page 2, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"10. On all top waste and slubbing waste, 20 cents per pound.

"11. Roving waste and ring waste, 16 cents per pound.

"12. Nolls, carbonized, 16 cents per pound.

"13. Nolls, not carbonized, 13 cents per pound.

"14. Garnetted waste, 13 cents per pound.

"15. Thread waste, yarn waste, and wool wastes not specified, 11 1/2 cents per pound.

"16. Shoddy, mungo, and wool extract, 10 cents per pound.

"17. Woolen rags and flocks, 5 cents per pound.

"18. Combed wool or tops, made wholly or in part of wool, or camel's hair, 23 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Idaho that we have passed page 1, and amendments to it are not in order.

Mr. FRENCH. The amendment is intended to apply to the last two lines in paragraph 1 on page 1.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the wrong print of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's print is evidently not the same as that which the Chair has.

Mr. FRENCH. Then I had the wrong print handed to me. The amendment would apply to lines 1 to 7, inclusive, on page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of paragraph 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"10. On all top waste and slubbing waste, 20 cents per pound.

"11. Roving waste and ring waste, 16 cents per pound.

"12. Nolls, carbonized, 16 cents per pound.

"13. Nolls, not carbonized, 13 cents per pound.

"14. Garnetted waste, 13 cents per pound.

"15. Thread waste, yarn waste, and wool wastes not specified, 11 1/2 cents per pound.

"16. Shoddy, mungo, and wool extract, 10 cents per pound.

"17. Woolen rags and flocks, 5 cents per pound.

"18. Combed wool or tops, made wholly or in part of wool, or camel's hair, 23 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, just a word in regard to this. The amendment as applied to this paragraph recognizes the principle that I suggested a little while ago, to wit, a duty upon the specific basis, and I have applied these figures to the particular items upon the report of the Tariff Board.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman inform us as to the lines and pages of the Payne bill which he introduced as an amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. They are not exactly the items mentioned in the Payne bill, but they are practically the same. They are raised 2 or 3 cents.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has changed the figures?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; slightly. In the change I would say that by comparing the figures I have suggested in the amendment with the existing law it will be noticed that I have scaled down the existing law something like from 33 1/4 per cent to 50 per cent, and I think they are fairly the figures that may be used upon a study of the report of the Tariff Board.

Now, just a word upon the tariff commission in addition to what I have said. I believe firmly in a tariff commission, and I believe that the necessity for a tariff commission within the last several years is apparent as never before. Prior to that time the great law of competition adjusted between the producer and the consumer the question of price to the extent that very little attention needed to be paid to any particular tariff law so long as the duty was high enough to furnish protection, competition doing the rest. But with the organization of wealth as it has been going on for some years in this country, in many lines competition has become more and more nearly eliminated, and just to that extent and to meet that condition we have today a necessity for a tariff law that shall not recognize one whit of protection higher than the difference that exists between the cost of production in this country and in foreign countries.

I submit that the facts upon which a law of this kind can be framed are facts that can be ascertained best by a nonpartisan, not a bipartisan, commission; a nonpartisan commission that will know no politics but will place before the people of this country the facts upon which legislation can be based.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, this bill illustrates the insincerity and the partisanship of the Democratic pretenses to revise the tariff. It is the same bill which they passed last year before the Tariff Board had investigated or reported on the wool schedule; and, by introducing it again without any changes, they apparently wish to emphasize and parade their contempt of the Tariff Board and to intimate that from their superficial investigation and their inner consciousness they can evolve a better bill than all the long and nonpartisan and thorough study of the Tariff Board can produce. They practically boast that knowledge of the facts is of no assistance to them in passing a bill. I think the certainty that none of their bills are likely to become law contributes largely to their jaunty

confidence, and that if they had the full power and responsibility and knew that they were framing a statute and not simply a political platform their work would be different. They pretended originally to be in favor of a tariff board which should thoroughly investigate and report facts without partisanship, and so lay the basis for a scientific tariff. President Taft took up the project and earnestly pressed it upon Congress, and the last Republican Congress framed such a bill, and it was only defeated on the last day of the session by a Democratic filibuster. But the Republicans were able to provide in another bill for the present annual Tariff Board, and though less permanent than the tariff commission which President Taft advocated, it has for this year had the same power and scope. The President appointed to it men of such ability and character as to command the respect and confidence of everyone, and the extraordinary and unlooked-for result has been that so far the whole board, consisting of three Republicans and two Democrats, has been unanimous in its findings in every report. That of itself is something novel and remarkable in our tariff history and augurs well for the success of the system. When we have the facts agreed upon the difficulties in framing a scientific and satisfactory law ought to be easily overcome. And yet the Democratic Party absolutely ignores this situation, pushes to one side the full statement of facts which the Democrats as well as the Republicans on the Tariff Board have agreed to, and takes its stand again on the same bill which it prepared before the Tariff Board had made its investigation. This well illustrates those qualities of obstinacy and viciousness which the animal which symbolizes the Democratic Party represents. They insist on their bourgeois prerogative of learning nothing and forgetting nothing.

I think the reports of the Tariff Board are of great value and should be the basis of tariff revision. The Republican Party, under the leadership of President Taft, has adopted this system, and the unanimous reports which we have so far received from the board are most encouraging. The wool bill adopted by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee is based upon the findings of the board, and while no tariff law upon such a complicated question can satisfy everyone, I think it is a wise solution of a most difficult problem, and I hope it will be substituted for the stale and partisan and temporizing measure offered by the Democratic majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

4. On yarns made wholly or in part of wool, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment to section 3, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, by striking out lines 14 and 15 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"On yarns, made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty shall be 24 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 10 per cent ad valorem."

"Valued at more than 30 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 15 per cent ad valorem."

"Valued at more than 50 cents and not more than 80 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 20 per cent ad valorem."

"Valued at more than 80 cents per pound, 24 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have proposed would harmonize the paragraph now under consideration with the paragraph as it would have existed had my previous amendments prevailed.

It reduces the present duty on yarns made wholly or in part of wool valued at not more than 30 cents per pound from 27½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein plus 35 per cent ad valorem to 24 cents per pound on the wool contained therein and in addition 10 per cent ad valorem; on yarns valued at more than 30 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound it reduces the present duty from 38½ cents per pound plus 40 per cent ad valorem to 24 cents plus 15 per cent ad valorem. On yarns valued at more than 50 cents and not more than 80 cents per pound it reduces the present duty from 38½ cents per pound plus 40 per cent ad valorem to 24 cents per pound plus 20 per cent ad valorem; and on yarns valued at more than 80 cents per pound it reduces the duty under the present law from 38½ cents per pound plus 40 per cent ad valorem to 24 cents per pound plus 25 per cent ad valorem.

This represents what I think is a fair deduction of rates that should be placed upon yarns of the various character that I have mentioned from a study of the findings of the Tariff Board.

Some Members may feel that these rates are too high and others may feel that they are too low, and that is a question to be determined by thrashing this matter out still further in the House and in the Senate, and this is what I want to help determine. For my part, as applied to the wool schedule or any other schedule, I desire to be governed by the facts shown by the findings of a tariff commission.

The people of this country are entitled to the right of purchasing all commodities at the lowest reasonable price consistent with the production of the commodity in this country.

The consumers do not ask more than this. They are willing that fair protection shall be given. They are willing that fair rates shall be maintained, and I believe that the people generally have confidence in the findings of the Tariff Board and will demand of this Congress that it enact such laws fixing such schedules as will hew to the line and retain no greater duty than that which is absolutely needed for the maintenance of any industry.

I said a year ago, and I repeat, that Schedule K should be modified at the earliest possible moment, and that this modification should be in the interest not only of the consumer but of those engaged in the wool industry.

I believed a year ago that the wish of the country should have been met, and that, upon the basis of the facts that we had at that time we should have prepared a wool tariff to take the place of Schedule K that would have been in closest harmony with the facts as they were known to the country.

Failing, however, to bring about the passage of such a law, I believe that it is the imperative duty of this Congress to enact a law that will take the place of Schedule K, that will give to the producer the protection to which he is deserving and which the people want him to have and which it is indicated by the Tariff Board's report he should have, but at the same time will remove the inequalities of the present law and in turn give to the consumer of this country the consideration to which he is entitled.

In other words, as applied to this schedule or any other, I believe in protection, but the kind of protection that not alone protects the producer, but as well the consumer.

I hope our Democratic friends will earnestly strive for tariff modification, and that they will not try to mislead the country by pretending to be in favor of tariff modification when they have it in their power to pass through this House a bill based upon the report of the Tariff Board that will correct the evils under the present law and that will meet the approval of the Senate and of the Chief Executive.

If our Democratic friends then want to go beyond that and set forth what they would do if in control of both branches of Congress and the Executive Office, that would be their privilege.

This first, however, is something they can accomplish, and I submit that to do so is a duty upon them no less than upon Republicans who are striving for tariff modification upon the basis of the Tariff Board's report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], which is to strike out the provisions in the Underwood bill relating to yarns, and insert the language of the Payne bill relating to yarns with the figures increased so as to make the tariff rate considerably higher than is proposed in the substitute recommended by the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee, in my opinion ought not to prevail. I do not undertake to say that the minority report represents the sum of human wisdom; but under the circumstances, representing as it does a bill to carry out the recommendations of the Tariff Board, I think this side of the House ought to stand as nearly as possible by that, and not endeavor, by amendments proposed to this bill, to increase the rates over the rates contained in our own substitute bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

5. On cloths, knit fabrics, felts not woven, and all manufactures of every description made, by any process, wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this act, the duty shall be 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to congratulate Congress and the country upon this the first opportunity in the history of Federal legislation to enact a tariff law formed strictly upon the commission method of collecting information respecting industrial conditions here and in foreign countries. The bill

offered by the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee is the first real business tariff measure that was ever submitted to Congress for consideration. It is framed in such a fashion that the duties shall only cover the difference in the cost of producing wool and woollen fabrics here and abroad, thereby affording adequate protection to American producers and prohibiting the increase of prices by monopolistic combinations to a point not justified by the cost of production at home. This is in strict conformity with the standard of protection fixed in the Republican national platform of 1908. The report submitted by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, in support of the bill they propose, declares that the people at the general election in 1910 repudiated the policy of protection and gave an unmistakable indorsement of the Democratic policy of tariff for revenue only. That interpretation of the result of the election in 1910 will not bear the test of historical analysis. The only time since the Civil War that the people of the United States at a general election abandoned the Republican tariff policy and accepted the policy of the Democratic Party was in 1892, and that abandonment was temporary only, for in 1896, by an unprecedented majority, the voters returned the Republican Party to power and gave its tariff policy an unqualified indorsement.

In 1908 the Republican Party in its national platform specifically reaffirmed the doctrine of protection and fixed the standard of duties to be imposed upon competitive commodities. The platform declared that the incoming administration should revise the tariff in accordance with that standard at a special session of Congress immediately following the inauguration of President Taft. No tariff board or commission had been provided to collect information respecting industrial conditions here and in foreign countries so that Congress might be able to measure the duties according to that standard with practical certainty.

President Taft had no discretion but to call Congress together in obedience to the pledge of the party which elected him to the Presidency and to recommend an immediate revision of the tariff schedules. Congress was compelled to undertake that work under the old method of tariff revision. It supplied itself with all the information that was available and enacted the Payne tariff law. That law was a disappointment to many people throughout the country, but it was impossible under the existing circumstances and with the material at hand to have made a tariff that would have satisfied the country. Ex-President Roosevelt, in a speech in the Northwest a few days ago, quoted from a speech he made in 1910 favoring the commission method of tariff revision. The quotation is as follows:

As a means toward the attainment of the end in view we have as yet devised nothing in any way so effective as a tariff commission. There should be a commission of well-paid experts, men who should not represent any special interest or industry, who should be masters of their subjects, men of the very highest character, who should approach the matter with absolute disregard of every outside consideration.

If it had occurred to the mind of the distinguished ex-President as early as 1906 that a commission was necessary for the proper revision of the tariff, and if he had used his commanding influence toward securing the creation of such a commission, one would doubtless have been created, and Congress, when it met in special session in March, 1909, would have been supplied with trustworthy information showing the difference in the cost of production here and in other countries, and the Payne tariff would doubtless have been so framed as to have met with general approval. But the ex-President at no time during his service as Chief Magistrate of the Government made any official reference to or suggestion of the need of a tariff commission.

Let me say to gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that the defeat of the Republican Party at the general election in 1910 can not be interpreted to mean an indorsement of the Democratic tariff policy. Your party, gentlemen, was simply used as a scourge to chastise the Republican Party for what the people believed to be its failure to keep one of the most important pledges it made in the campaign of 1908. Gentlemen, your party is a most effective scourge. Following the election of a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress in 1892 the country was converted into a desolate industrial waste from ocean to ocean. Monuments to the unwisdom of your tariff policy were seen in every community throughout the land in smokeless chimneys and idle mills. During that administration you established equality of opportunity on the industrial graveyard basis. You created equal opportunities for all by destroying opportunities for all. Do not lay the flattering unction to your souls that the ballot in November, 1910, meant an indorsement of your tariff policy.

I read with considerable care the elaborate report of the Ways and Means Committee in behalf of the bill reported by the

Democratic members of that committee and was greatly surprised to note the hypercritical character of the objections made to the report of the Tariff Board on the wool question. I have also read with much care the report of the Tariff Board, and I am impressed with the belief that that report is the most thorough and exhaustive document of the kind that has ever been submitted to Congress. The criticisms seem to be based upon the free-trade theory, following the doctrine of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Bastiat, and other free-trade philosophers. The author of the report entered upon his work with a view of picking flaws in the report of the Tariff Board. It is urged that it is impossible to ascertain with exact certainty the cost of production of a given product in any country; that the cost of woollen fabrics is not exactly the same in any two mills, and that the cost varies in different seasons of the year. Every practical man knows that. There are differences in the cost of producing the same line of articles in the same country, depending upon the facilities, organization, location, and management of individual mills. There may also be differences in the cost of producing a given line of articles at different periods of time. But the making of a tariff is a practical question, and all Congress can attain is reasonable certainty in fixing duties to meet the differences in cost of production. The report itself discloses with practical certainty the differences in the cost of producing wools and woollens in this country and in foreign countries. It furnishes a reliable guide for making a business tariff. If Congress shall defer the enactment of laws until it can embody in them mathematical accuracy and absolute justice, it might as well close its doors and cease its endeavors. Absolute exactness in human affairs is an unattainable ideal.

The report of the committee deals in refinement of definition. It insists that the terms "cost" and "expense" are not synonymous; that "cost" means the degree of sacrifice one must make to produce a particular article, while "expense" means the amount of money he must pay for the purchase of the article. Farmer Jones owns a horse that he can sell in the market at any time for \$150, and his friend Brown, in the city, is a dealer in farm implements, wagons, carriages, and so forth, and Jones desires a carriage and Brown wants a horse. The carriage Jones has his heart set upon is priced at \$150. Instead of selling his horse for \$150 in cash and buying the carriage from Brown with the money, Jones exchanges the horse for the carriage. That transaction would be a barter. Jones, in his college days, took a course in political economy under a learned professor, and he was taught the scientific difference between "cost" and "expense." The horse he traded to Brown he had raised from a colt. He reckoned the sacrifice he made in the way of time, care, and food for the animal and found that it amounted to \$75. He congratulated himself upon the fact that he got a \$150 carriage for \$75 worth of sacrifice. But upon reflection it came to his mind that what he made on the carriage he lost on the horse, and that from a business standpoint there was no difference between cost and expense in that transaction, whatever science might say about it.

If a woolgrower raises a thousand bushels of oats on his farm with which to feed his sheep during the winter, and the oats should be worth 35 cents a bushel at the machine at threshing time, he could sell his crop for \$350, and with that money buy other oats as he needed them to feed his sheep. In reckoning the cost of the wool clip the following year he would consider as a factor the \$350 worth of oats which he fed the sheep, but if he fed the oats he raised himself scientific economists would say that he must not reckon the value of the oats in the market, but he must ascertain the sacrifice he made in producing them, and by that method it might turn out that the oats cost him only 20 cents a bushel, or \$200 for the thousand bushels, in the way of sacrifice. That process would cheapen the cost of the wool by ignoring the market value of the oats fed to the sheep. The absurdity of that kind of refinement in practical affairs is easily apparent. Economic philosophers spend much time and energy wrangling with each other over definitions. It has taken generations to determine the definition of rent, and even now a landowner who leases his farm for \$1,000 a year can not know, scientifically, how much, if any, rent he receives for the use of the land. He is apt to call it all rent, but the economist will demonstrate to him by some abstruse philosophy that the bulk of the returns he receives is income on his investment and not rent for the use of the land. Refinements of this character in practical matters are hardly worthy of consideration, however important they may be in science. When I read an article, intended for practical purposes, based upon the "law of diminishing returns," I give up in despair; yet that law is recognized as sound by all scientific economists. It is like the Malthusian law of population, it is scientifically sound but practically unimportant.

The report of the Tariff Board upon the woolen industry shows that it is not difficult to ascertain the difference in the cost of production of wools and woollens in this country and in foreign countries from a business standpoint. It discloses the average cost through a period of years of the bulk of wool grown and woollens produced in other countries that may invade our own markets if our tariffs are unduly low. It is a practical question, and is based altogether upon business principles. The report contains information that will enable Congress to act with business precision.

The bill proposed by the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee is identically the same as the bill that passed both Houses of Congress last summer and was vetoed by the President. If that bill should go through both Houses of Congress again it would doubtless meet the same fate at the hands of the President it met last summer. There are additional reasons now why the President should not approve the bill. When he vetoed it last summer the Tariff Board had not made its report on the wool schedule, but now the report is before Congress and has been for over three months, and the President now has irrefutable proof that the bill does not even approximately fix the duties on wools and woollens so as to cover the difference in cost of production here and in foreign countries.

The advocates of the Democratic measure do not pretend that it does, but they undertake to justify it by attacking the reliability of the report of the Tariff Board. The board is composed of able, upright, disinterested men, three of whom are Republicans and two of whom are Democrats. They all concur in the report. Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle know that the consideration of their bill is "love's labor lost." They know that if it goes to the President again he can not, in keeping with his pledge to the people, give it his sanction and approval. They know that if they insist on that measure it means no revision of the wool schedule at all. The bill submitted by the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means is made in faithful conformity to the report of the Tariff Board. The duties it imposes cover the difference in cost of production here and in foreign countries and no more. It will reasonably protect American producers and manufacturers of wools and woollens, and it will likewise protect American consumers by reducing the tariff to such a point that exorbitant prices can not be exacted. If the Republican bill should pass the two Houses of Congress, it would be approved by the President and would become a law. Every Member of this House knows that to a moral certainty. Every Member of this House knows that it is the only proposition for the revision of the wool schedule that may be enacted into law. That bill reduces the duties on wools and woollens on an average of over 40 per cent. Here, then, is an opportunity for Democratic Members of this body to do something for the relief of the people of the country. They have been talking long and lustily about the enormous burdens that are imposed upon the people by the high tariff on wool, and yet they persist in blindly adhering to an impossible measure, one which they know can not become a law. They refuse to join with the Republicans in support of a measure that will reduce the duty on wools and woollens more than 40 per cent on an average—a measure that will be approved by the President and become a law if it passes both branches of Congress. I gravely charge that if there is no reduction of the duties on wool and woollens during this Congress the responsibility will be with the Democratic majority in this body. They and they only will have to answer to the people for the failure of Congress to afford adequate relief from the unnecessarily high tariff on one of the great necessities of life. Are the majority Members of this House acting in good faith and with an earnest desire to afford relief to the country in persisting in their support of a measure that they know will not become a law? Are the majority Members acting in good faith with the country in refusing to support a bill that will afford relief to the people and that will become a law if they give it their support?

The Tariff Board has also submitted a report on the cotton schedule, and that report is now before Congress. What will the majority side of the House do in relation to the cotton schedule? A cotton-revision bill was passed last summer and was vetoed by the President because of its heedless character and because there was no way of determining whether the duties provided in it covered the difference in cost of production here and abroad. The report is ready now, and it clearly shows that the duties on cotton fabrics should be substantially reduced. It shows that they are unnecessarily high. The President, in submitting the cotton report to Congress, calls particular attention to the fact that the duties on cotton fabrics should be substantially reduced, and he urges Congress to revise the cotton schedule without delay. Here is another opportunity for the majority Members of the House to show their good faith

to the country by reporting and passing a bill for the revision of the cotton schedule in accordance with the report of the Tariff Board. A bill of that kind will be approved by the President if it passes the two Houses of Congress. Every Member of this body knows that. It is up to the Democratic majority of the House to determine whether there shall be a revision of the cotton schedule and a substantial reduction of the existing duties, or whether this session of Congress shall adjourn without taking any action thereon at all. They can not escape responsibility by captious criticism of the report of the Tariff Board. They can not escape responsibility by persisting in their support of a mongrel measure they know will never be enacted into law. When they turn their backs upon meritorious measures for the revision of the wool schedule and the cotton schedule upon business principles they assume responsibility for the failure of legislation. They can not deceive the people. The issue is squarely presented; they must face it.

I sincerely hope the Ways and Means Committee will report a cotton-tariff revision bill in harmony with the report of the Tariff Board, for I know it would become a law and afford relief to the country.

The Democratic national platform made at Denver, Colo., in 1908, contains this declaration:

We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber, and logs and that those articles be placed on the free list.

No free-lumber bill has been reported by the Democratic majority in this Congress. They have reported and passed through the House bills for the revision of the metal schedule, the cotton schedule, the chemical schedule, and the wool schedule—measures which their platform did not specifically promise—but not a word has been said nor a thing been done by them toward the fulfillment of the emphatic declaration of their platform for free lumber. Let me ask gentlemen on the other side of the House when they intend to carry that promise into effect? Why has it been ignored thus far? Lumber is a universal necessity to civilized man. The Bureau of Corporations, in a report recently issued, shows that hundreds of millions of acres of the most valuable standing timber of the country have been purchased and are now owned by a few wealthy syndicates. Those syndicates do not convert the timber into lumber. They have secured a practical monopoly of one of nature's most beneficent gifts to man. They are holding the timber for the rise in price that must come and that has come from increasing demand for lumber. They sell stumpage to the millmen at prices which they fix themselves. They confer no benefit on society, but have made hundreds of millions of dollars in monopolizing tremendous areas of timberlands. They are the chief beneficiaries of the tariff on lumber. Did your party, gentlemen of the majority, speak in good faith when it declared unequivocally in favor of free timber, free lumber, and free logs? Did you mean it then and do you mean it still? If you were in good faith in that declaration, why have you not reported and passed a bill providing for free lumber? The majority of your side of the House come from the Southern States where there are extensive timber interests. Can this be the reason why you have made no effort to put lumber on the free list in fulfillment of your pledge? Is it possible that you have been inoculated with the virus of protection in so far as timber and lumber are concerned? Ninety per cent of the people of the United States would welcome with enthusiasm a law removing the duty from lumber in the hope that it would tend to cheapen the material out of which they build their homes and in the belief that it would promote the conservation of one of the most important of our natural resources.

I wonder what explanation the Democrats can make in the campaign this year for their complete repudiation of the specific and unqualified pledge they made to remove the duty from lumber. We on the Republican side can abide with confidence the judgment of the people upon the record of nonperformance made by the Democratic majority of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That on and after the day when this act shall go into effect all goods, wares, and merchandise previously imported, and hereinbefore enumerated, described, and provided for, for which no entry has been made, and all such goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to the duties imposed by this act and no other duty, upon the entry or the withdrawal thereof.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of calling attention to a very remarkable document which just came into my hands on yester-

day, entitled "Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft. What each has done for the People of the United States." It is a document containing about 24 pages.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] desires to throw the afternoon open to a political debate, I shall not object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman that I do not, and if objection is made, I will have to insist.

Mr. MANN. If objection would be made from that side of the House to political debate on this side, I do not intend that they shall commence it over there.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to assure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that what I wish to say is pertinent to the wool bill that is now under discussion. This is only preliminary. The document I hold in my hand is signed by the Roosevelt League of New York State, and the address is 1 Madison Avenue, New York City.

On page 20 of that document, under the alliterative head of "Taft's tariff tactics," I read what the author has to say with reference to the President of the United States and his attitude upon the tariff question, and especially his attitude upon the woolen schedule.

He says:

Although Mr. Taft's tariff policy does not relate to his promises to carry on the Roosevelt policies, it is mentioned here as illustrating his sympathy with the industrial powers and his lack of interest in relieving the burdens of the common citizen.

Mr. Taft's weakness in the tariff controversy has indefinitely postponed the settlement of that disturbing issue. (After the Payne-Aldrich bill was drawn under the dominating influence of the big interests, Mr. Taft took the stump in praise of that bill, and in defense of Aldrich, Tawney, and the other stand-pat leaders.)

When the Democrats came into power, largely as a result of the national indignation at the Payne-Aldrich tariff, they joined with the insurgent Republicans and passed an excellent bill reducing the tariff on wool (the La Follette-Underwood bill). Mr. Taft vetoed the bill on the ground that he desired Congress to wait before doing anything until a commission, appointed by himself, had reported. Seeing, therefore, that there was no hope of any real tariff reform during the session, Congress hastily passed several other tariff bills in order to put Mr. Taft and the stand-paters on record. Had Mr. Taft had the intelligence and the courage to sign the wool bill, the tariff question would now be less full of uncertainty and we should be much nearer a condition of business confidence and security.

In addition to these faults of judgment in defending the Payne-Aldrich bill and in vetoing the wool bill, Mr. Taft has committed himself to the doctrine that the proper protection should be measured by the difference in cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the manufacturer, a doctrine which gives two profits to the manufacturer and very little promise of relief to the consumer.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not care to make any extended remarks on this remarkable statement. However, just a word—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that he may have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, it would be interesting to know from our Republican friends whether they agree with this statement by the sponsors of the distinguished candidate for the Republican presidential nomination—whether they agree, for instance, that "Mr. Taft is in sympathy with the industrial powers and has a lack of interest in relieving the burdens of the common citizen." It would be interesting to know whether they agree with Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers in this campaign that "the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was drawn under the dominating influence of the big interests." It would also be very interesting to know—and perhaps our Republican friends would be willing to say now—whether they indorse or admit the position taken by their former idol that "Mr. Taft has committed himself to the doctrine that the proper protection should be measured by the difference in cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the manufacturer—a doctrine which gives two profits to the manufacturer and very little promise of relief to the consumer."

Mr. McCALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will.

Mr. McCALL. Do I understand the gentleman from Iowa to say that Mr. Roosevelt is responsible for these views?

Mr. PEPPER. Well, I would hardly dare to say that he was not responsible.

Mr. McCALL. I understood the gentleman to say that he was responsible, that he said these were the views of the former President.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts prepared to deny that Mr. Roosevelt is responsible for the circulation of this document?

Mr. McCALL. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. PEPPER. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it is signed by the Roosevelt League, and is circulated quite generally by the men who are back of Mr. Roosevelt in his candidacy for the Presidency.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman who composes the Roosevelt League?

Mr. PEPPER. I have no doubt the gentleman would like to know who compose the Roosevelt League. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am not prepared to say who compose the membership of it, but I assume that they are residents of the State of New York.

Mr. BUTLER. Is not this circular which is circulated an anonymous one?

Mr. PEPPER. It is signed by the Roosevelt League of New York, and I assume there is such a league up there.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the gentleman from Iowa think that it is proper to insert by way of doxology "Bryan on Harmon." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. POU. Does not the gentleman from Iowa think that ex-President Roosevelt would repudiate the document if it did not receive his indorsement?

Mr. PEPPER. From what I know of the gentleman's characteristics I have no doubt he would.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, I never saw one of these circulars. Where did the gentleman get it?

Mr. PEPPER. It came through the ordinary course of mail.

Mr. MANN. It must have been circulated among the Democrats only; not one has been sent to me.

Mr. PEPPER. I am surprised at that, because the gentleman from Illinois is mentioned in it.

Mr. MANN. I have not seen any copy of it on this side of the House, and I notice it comes from the gentleman's side.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that at the bottom of page 7 his name is mentioned as being a Taft leader in the House, and that he protested against the constitutionality of the bill to prevent corporations from contributing to national campaign funds that was passed. So I assume that the gentleman will be interested in reading the document.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken, I have not the slightest interest in reading any anonymous article about anything that I have done in the House, and I am not interested in reading even some articles that are not anonymous.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know whether this is anonymous or not. But it is interesting and I commend it to the gentleman's attention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 22195) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, and had directed him to report the same back without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to its final passage. And, pending that motion, I desire to say to the gentleman from New York that if he desires to offer his bill as a substitute instead of a motion to recommit I will consent that he may do it.

Mr. PAYNE. I think I will move to recommit later.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the motion for the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. PAYNE. I move to recommit the bill with instructions as follows.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PAYNE moves to recommit H. R. 22195 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York if he desires the Clerk to read the substitute bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not insist upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We are all familiar with the bill, and I suggest that the gentleman from New York ask unanimous consent that the reading of it be dispensed with.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not like to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of my own bill.

Mr. MANN. I think the bill or amendment ought to be read; it is not very long.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the substitute, as follows:

That the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of the paragraphs of Schedule K of section 1 of said act, from 360 to 395, inclusive of both, and inserting in place thereof the following:

"1. All wools, hair of the camel, goat, alpaca, and other like animals shall be divided, for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon, into the two following classes:

"2. Class 1, that is to say, merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools, or other wools of merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including Bagdad wool, China lamb's wool, Castel Branco, Adrianople skin wool or butcher's wool, and such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Aires, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, Egypt, Morocco, and elsewhere, and Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used, and all wools not hereinafter included in class 2, and also the hair of the camel, Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals.

"3. Class 2, that is to say, Donskoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, Russian camel's hair, and all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Syria, and elsewhere, excepting improved wools hereinafter provided for.

"4. The standard samples of all wools, which are now or may be hereafter deposited in the principal customhouses of the United States, under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be the standards for the classification of wools under this act, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to renew these standards and to make such additions to them from time to time as may be required, and he shall cause to be deposited like standards in other customhouses of the United States when they may be needed.

"5. Whenever wools of class 2 shall have been improved by the admixture of merino or English blood, from their present character, as represented by the standard samples now or hereafter to be deposited in the principal customhouses of the United States, such improved wools shall be classified for duty as class 1.

"6. If any bale or package of wool or hair specified in this act, invoiced or entered as of class 2, or claimed by the importer to be dutiable as of class 2, shall contain any wool or hair subject to the rate of duty of class 1, the whole bale or package shall be subject to the rate of duty chargeable on wool of class 1; and if any bale or package be claimed by the importer to be shoddy, mungo, flocks, wool, hair, or other material of any class specified in this act, and such bale contain any admixture of any one or more of said materials, or of any other material, the whole bale or package shall be subject to duty at the highest rate imposed upon any article in said bale or package.

"7. The duty on all wools and hair of class 1, if imported in the grease, shall be laid upon the basis of its clean content. The clean content shall be determined by scouring tests which shall be made according to regulations which the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. The duty on all wools and hair of class 1 imported in the grease shall be 18 cents per pound on the clean content, as defined above. If imported scoured, the duty shall be 19 cents per pound.

"8. The duty on all wools of class 2, including camel's hair of class 2, imported in their natural condition, shall be 7 cents per pound. If scoured, 19 cents per pound: *Provided*, That on consumption of wools of class 2, including camel's hair, in the manufacture of carpets, druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, mats, rugs for floors, screens, covers, hassocks, bed-sides, art squares, and portions of carpets or carpeting hereafter manufactured or produced in the United States in whole or in part from wools of class 2, including camel's hair, upon which duties have been paid, there shall be allowed to the manufacturer or producer of such articles a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid less 1 per cent of such duties on the amount of the wools of class 2, including camel's hair of class 2, contained therein; such drawback shall be paid under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

"9. The duty on wools on the skin shall be 2 cents less per pound than is imposed upon the clean content as provided for wools of class 1, and 1 cent less per pound than is imposed upon wools of class 2 imported in their natural condition, the quantity to be ascertained under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

"10. Top waste and slubbing waste, 18 cents per pound.

"11. Roving waste and ring waste, 14 cents per pound.

"12. Nolls, carbonized, 14 cents per pound.

"13. Nolls, not carbonized, 11 cents per pound.

"14. Garnetted waste, 11 cents per pound.

"15. Thread waste, yarn waste, and wool wastes not specified, 9½ cents per pound.

"16. Shoddy, mungo, and wool extract, 8 cents per pound.

"17. Woolen rags and flocks, 2 cents per pound.

"18. Combed wool or tops, made wholly or in part of wool, or camel's hair, 20 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 5 per cent ad valorem.

"19. Wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, but less advanced than yarn, not specially provided for in this section, 20 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 8 per cent ad valorem.

"20. On yarns, made wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 30 cents per pound, the duty shall be 21½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 10 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 30 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, 21½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 15 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 50 cents and not more than 80 cents per pound, 21½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 20 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 80 cents per pound, 21½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem.

"21. On cloths, knit fabrics, flannels, felts, and all fabrics of every description made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 25 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 60 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 60 cents and not more than 80 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 80 cents and not more than \$1 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 45 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than \$1 and not more than \$1.50 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 50 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 55 per cent ad valorem.

"22. On blankets and flannels for underwear composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 23½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 20 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 50 cents per pound, 23½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem.

"Valued at more than 50 cents per pound, 23½ cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 30 per cent ad valorem.

Provided, That on blankets over 3 yards in length the same duties shall be paid as on cloths.

"23. On ready-made clothing and articles of wearing apparel, knitted or woven, of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part and composed wholly or in part of wool, the rate of duty shall be as follows:

"If valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, the duty shall be 25 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 60 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 40 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than 60 cents and not more than 80 cents per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 45 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than 80 cents and not more than \$1 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 50 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than \$1 and not more than \$1.50 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 55 per cent ad valorem.

"If valued at more than \$1.50 per pound, 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 60 per cent ad valorem.

"24. On all manufactures of every description made wholly or in part of wool, not specially provided for in this section, the duty shall be 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 50 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That if the component material of chief value in such manufactures is wood, paper, rubber, or any of the baser metals, the duty shall be 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 35 per cent ad valorem, and if the component material of chief value in such manufactures is silk, fur, precious or semiprecious stones, or gold, silver, or platinum, the duty shall be 26 cents per pound on the wool contained therein, and in addition thereto 55 per cent ad valorem.

"25. On hand-made Aubusson, Axminster, Oriental, and similar carpets and rugs, made wholly or in part of wool, the rate of duty shall be 50 per cent ad valorem; on all other carpets of every description, druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, mats, rugs for floors, screens, covers, hassocks, bed-sides, art squares, and portions of carpets or carpeting made wholly or in part of wool, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem.

"26. Whenever, in any schedule of this act, the word 'wool' is used in connection with a manufactured article of which it is a component material, it shall be held to include wool or hair of the sheep, camel, goat, alpaca, or other animal, whether manufactured by the woolen, worsted, felt, or any other process.

"27. The foregoing paragraphs, providing the rates of duty herein for manufactures of wool, shall take effect on the 1st day of January, 1913."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. PAYNE. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 104, nays 169, answered "present" 9, not voting 110, as follows:

YEAS—104.

Ainey	Curry	Hamilton, Mich.	McCall
Anderson, Minn.	Dalzell	Hanna	McCreary
Anthony	Danforth	Haugen	McGuire, Okla.
Austin	Davidson	Hayes	McKenzie
Bartholdt	De Forest	Heald	McKinney
Bates	Dodds	Henry, Conn.	McLaughlin
Bowman	Draper	Hill	McMorran
Browning	Driscoll, M. E.	Howland	Malby
Burke, Pa.	Esch	Hubbard	Mann
Burke, S. Dak.	Farr	Humphrey, Wash.	Miller
Butler	French	Jackson	Mondell
Calder	Gardner, Mass.	Kendall	Moon, Pa.
Cannon	Gardner, N. J.	Kennedy	Morgan
Cooper	Gillett	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Mott
Craw	Good	Lafferty	Murdock
Crumacker	Green, Iowa	La Follette	Neudham
Currier	Greene, Mass.	Longworth	Nelson

Norris	Prouty	Stephens, Cal.	Volstead
Nye	Rees	Sterling	Vreeland
Olmsted	Roberts, Mass.	Stevens, Minn.	Warburton
Parrau	Simmons	Sulloway	Wedemeyer
Payne	Sloan	Switzer	Wilder
Pickett	Smith, J. M. C.	Taylor, Ohio	Willis
Plumley	Smith, Saml. W.	Tilson	Wood, N. J.
Powers	Steenerson	Towner	Young, Kans.
Pray		Utter	Young, Mich.

NAYS—169.

Adamson	Edwards	Kindred	Rouse
Aiken, S. C.	Estopinal	Kinthead, N. J.	Rubey
Alexander	Faison	Kitchin	Rucker, Mo.
Allen	Fergusson	Konig	Russell
Anderson, Ohio	Ferris	Konop	Saunders
Ansberry	Finley	Korbly	Scully
Ashbrook	Fitzgerald	Lamb	Shackelford
Barnhart	Flood, Va.	Lee, Ga.	Sharp
Bartlett	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Pa.	Sherley
Bathrick	Foster	Lever	Sherwood
Beall, Tex.	Francis	Lindbergh	Sims
Blackmon	Garner	Linthicum	Sisson
Boehne	Garrett	Littlepage	Slayden
Booher	George	Lloyd	Small
Bulkley	Glass	McCoy	Smith, N. Y.
Burke, Wis.	Godwin, N. C.	McGillcuddy	Smith, Tex.
Burleson	Goeke	McKellar	Stanley
Burnett	Graham	Macon	Stedman
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Miss.
Callaway	Gregg, Pa.	Martin, Colo.	Stephens, Nebr.
Candler	Gregg, Tex.	Moon, Tenn.	Stephens, Tex.
Cantrill	Hamill	Moore, Tex.	Stone
Carlin	Hamilton, W. Va.	Morrison	Sweet
Carter	Hamlin	Moss, Ind.	Taggart
Claypool	Hammond	Murray	Talbott, Md.
Clayton	Hardy	Neeley	Talcott, N. Y.
Cline	Harrison, Miss.	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Collier	Hay	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Connell	Hayden	Padgett	Townsend
Conry	Heflin	Page	Tribble
Cox, Ohio	Helm	Patten, N. Y.	Turnbull
Cravens	Henry, Tex.	Pepper	Underwood
Curley	Hensley	Peters	Watkins
Daugherty	Holland	Post	Webb
Davenport	Howard	Pou	Whitacre
Davis, W. Va.	Hughes, Ga.	Rainey	White
Denver	Hull	Raker	Wickliffe
Dickinson	Jacoway	Randell, Tex.	Wilson, Pa.
Dixon, Ind.	James	Rauch	Young, Tex.
Doremus	Johnson, Ky.	Redfield	The Speaker
Doughton	Johnson, S. C.	Reilly	
Dupré	Jones	Roddenberry	
	Kent	Rothermel	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Akin, N. Y.	Donohoe	Fuller	Lobeck
Burgess	Focht	Langley	Rucker, Colo.
Campbell			

NOT VOTING—110.

Adair	Ellerbe	Humphreys, Miss.	Pujo
Ames	Evans	Kahn	Ransdell, La.
Andrus	Fairchild	Knowland	Reynolds
Ayres	Fields	Kopp	Richardson
Barchfeld	Fordney	Lafcan	Riordan
Bell, Ga.	Fornes	Langham	Roberts, Nev.
Berger	Foss	Lawrence	Robinson
Borland	Fowler	Legare	Rodenberg
Bradley	Gallagher	Lenroot	Sabath
Brantley	Goldfogle	Levy	Sells
Broussard	Goodwin, Ark.	Lewis	Sheppard
Brown	Gould	Lindsay	Smith, Cal.
Buchanan	Griest	Littleton	Sparkman
Cary	Gudger	Loud	Speer
Catlin	Guernsey	McDermott	Stack
Clark, Fla.	Hardwick	McHenry	Sulzer
Copley	Harris	McKinley	Taylor, Ala.
Covington	Harrison, N. Y.	Madden	Thayer
Cox, Ind.	Hartman	Maber	Thistlewood
Cullop	Hawley	Martin, S. Dak.	Tuttle
Davis, Minn.	Helgesen	Matthews	Underhill
Dent	Higgins	Mays	Weeks
Dickson, Miss.	Hinds	Moore, Pa.	Wilson, Ill.
Dies	Hobson	Morse, Wis.	Wilson, N. Y.
Difenderfer	Houston	Palmer	Witherspoon
Driscoll, D. A.	Howell	Patton, Pa.	Woods, Iowa
Dwight	Hughes, N. J.	Porter	
Dyer	Hughes, W. Va.	Prince	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.
The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he answered "No," as above recorded.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Until further notice:

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. LAWRENCE.

Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. STACK with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. REYBURN.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota.

Mr. GUDGER with Mr. LOUD.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. KOPP.
Mr. FOWLER with Mr. KNOWLAND.
Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. HELGESSEN.
Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. HAWLEY.
Mr. BROWN with Mr. HARRIS.
Mr. BROUSSARD with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. BORLAND with Mr. CARY.
Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. LANGHAM.
Mr. HINDS with Mr. GOULD.
Mr. LEGARE with Mr. SMITH of California.
Mr. MAYS with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.
Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. PRINCE.
Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.
Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. McDERMOTT with Mr. FOSS.
Mr. LOBECK with Mr. DYER.
Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. RODENBERG (commencing March 23).
Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. CAMPBELL (commencing March 25).
Mr. SABATH with Mr. CATLIN.
Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. PORTER (commencing April 1).
Mr. MAHER with Mr. KAHN.
Mr. COX of Indiana with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.
Mr. LINDSAY (against) with Mr. HIGGINS (to recommit).
Mr. WITHERSPOON with Mr. KOPP (commencing April 1).
Mr. SHEPPARD with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.
Mr. DIES with Mr. MADDEN.
Mr. EVANS with Mr. HOWELL (commencing March 29).
Mr. HARRISON of New York with Mr. GUERNESY.
Mr. UNDERHILL (against) with Mr. FORDNEY (to recommit).
On the vote:
Mr. LITTLETON (against) with Mr. DWIGHT (to recommit).
Mr. SULZER (against) with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (to recommit).
Mr. DENT (against) with Mr. GRIEST (to recommit).
Mr. DIFENDERFER (against) with Mr. LAFEAN (to recommit).
Mr. GOLDFOGLE (against) with Mr. SPEER (to recommit).
Mr. PALMER (against) with Mr. MCKINLEY (to recommit).
Mr. ADAIR (against) with Mr. MATTHEWS (to recommit).
Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey (against) with Mr. BARCHFELD (to recommit).

From March 7 until further notice:

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. FULLER.

Ending April 5:

Mr. THAYER with Mr. AMES.

Mr. CULLOP with Mr. FOCHT.

Ending April 13:

Mr. BUCHANAN with Mr. HARTMAN.

Ending April 2, inclusive:

Mr. BURGESS with Mr. WEEKS.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with my colleague from Kentucky Mr. FIELDS, and I understood he was to be here to-day and therefore I voted "aye." If the gentleman did not vote, I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. LANGLEY was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I was out of the room, and I guess I came in a little too late to vote, but I would like to have the RECORD show that had I voted I would have voted "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 92, answered "present" 9, not voting 101, as follows:

YEAS—190.

Adair	Byrnes, Tenn.	Edwards	Hamlin
Adamson	Callaway	Estopinal	Hammond
Aiken, S. C.	Candler	Faison	Hanna
Akin, N. Y.	Cantrill	Fergusson	Hardy
Alexander	Carlin	Ferris	Harrison, Miss.
Allen	Claypool	Finley	Haugen
Anderson, Minn.	Clayton	Fitzgerald	Hay
Anderson, Ohio	Cline	Flood, Va.	Hayden
Ansberry	Collier	Floyd, Ark.	Heflin
Barnhart	Connell	Foster	Helm
Bartlett	Conry	Garner	Henry, Tex.
Bathrick	Cox, Ohio	Garrett	Hensley
Beall, Tex.	Cravens	George	Holland
Blackmon	Curley	Glass	Howard
Boehne	Daugherty	Godwin, N. C.	Hubbard
Booher	Davenport	Goeke	Hughes, Ga.
Brantley	Davis, W. Va.	Goodwin, Ark.	Hull
Brown	Denver	Graham	Jackson
Bulkley	Dickinson	Gray	Jacoway
Burke, Wis.	Dixon, Ind.	Gregg, Pa.	James
Burleson	Doremus	Gregg, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.
Burnett	Doughton	Hamill	Johnson, S. C.
Byrnes, S. C.	Dupré	Hamilton, W. Va.	Jones

Kent
Kindred
Kinkead, N. J.
Kitchin
Konig
Konop
Korbly
Lafferty
La Follette
Lamb
Lee, Ga.
Lee, Pa.
Lever
Lewis
Lindbergh
Linthicum
Littlepage
Lloyd
McCoy
McGillcuddy
McKellar
Macon
Maguire, Nebr.
Martin, Colo.
Miller

Moon, Tenn.
Moore, Tex.
Morrison
Moss, Ind.
Murdoch
Murray
Neeley
Nelson
Norris
Nye
Oldfield
O'Shaunessy
Padgett
Page
Patten, N. Y.
Pepper
Peters
Post
Pou
Raney
Raker
Randell, Tex.
Randsell, La.
Rauch
Redfield

Relly
Roddenbery
Rothermel
Rouse
Rubey
Rucker, Mo.
Russell
Saunders
Scully
Shackelford
Sharp
Sherley
Sherwood
Sims
Sisson
Slayden
Small
Smith, N. Y.
Smith, Tex.
Stanley
Stedman
Steenerson
Stephens, Miss.
Stephens, Nebr.
Stephens, Tex.

Stevens, Minn.
Stone
Sweet
Taggart
Talbot, Md.
Talcott, N. Y.
Taylor, Colo.
Thomas
Townsend
Tribble
Turnbull
Underwood
Volstead
Warburton
Watkins
Webb
Whitacre
White
Wickliffe
Wilson, Pa.
Young, Kans.
Young, Tex.
The Speaker

NAYS—92.

Ainey
Anthony
Austin
Bartholdt
Bates
Bowman
Browning
Burke, Pa.
Burke, S. Dak.
Butler
Calder
Cannon
Cooper
Crago
Crumacker
Currier
Curry
Dalzell
Danforth
Davidson
De Forest
Dodds
Draper

Driscoll, M. E.
Esch
Farr
Francis
French
Gardner, Mass.
Gardner, N. J.
Gillett
Good
Green, Iowa
Greene, Mass.
Hamilton, Mich.
Hayes
Heald
Henry, Conn.
Higgins
Hill
Howland
Humphrey, Wash.
Kendall
Kennedy
Kinkaid, Nebr.
Knowland

Lawrence
Longworth
McCall
McCreary
McGuire, Okla.
McKenzie
McKinney
McLaughlin
McMorran
Malby
Mann
Mondell
Moon, Pa.
Morgan
Mott
Needham
Olmsted
Parran
Payne
Pickett
Plumley
Powers
Pray

Prouty
Rees
Roberts, Mass.
Roberts, Nev.
Simmons
Slemp
Sloan
Smith, J. M. C.
Smith, Saml. W.
Stephens, Cal.
Sterling
Sulloway
Switzer
Taylor, Ohio
Tilson
Townner
Utter
Vreeland
Wedemeyer
Wildner
Willis
Wood, N. J.
Young, Mich.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9.

Ashbrook
Burgess
Campbell

Donohoe
Focht

Fuller
Langley

Lobeck
Rucker, Colo.

NOT VOTING—101.

Ames
Andrus
Ayres
Barchfeld
Bell, Ga.
Berger
Borland
Bradley
Broussard
Buchanan
Carter
Cary
Catlin
Clark, Fla.
Copley
Covington
Cox, Ind.
Cullop
Davis, Minn.
Dent
Dickson, Miss.
Dies
Difenderfer
Driscoll, D. A.
Dwight
Dyer

Ellerbe
Evans
Fairchild
Fields
Fordney
Fornes
Foss
Fowler
Gallagher
Goldfogle
Gould
Griest
Gudger
Guernsey
Hardwick
Harris
Harrison, N. Y.
Hartman
Hawley
Helgesen
Hinds
Hobson
Houston
Howell
Hughes, N. J.
Hughes, W. Va.

Humphreys, Miss.
Kahn
Kopp
Lafean
Langham
Legare
Leuroot
Levy
Lindsay
Littleton
Loud
McDermott
McHenry
McKinley
Madden
Maher
Martin, S. Dak.
Matthews
Mays
Moore, Pa.
Morse, Wis.
Palmer
Patton, Pa.
Porter
Prince
Pujo

Reyburn
Richardson
Riordan
Robinson
Rodenberg
Sabath
Sells
Sheppard
Smith, Cal.
Sparkman
Speer
Stack
Sulzer
Taylor, Ala.
Thayer
Thistlewood
Tuttle
Underhill
Weeks
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, N. Y.
Witherspoon
Woods, Iowa

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.
The name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri was called and he voted "Aye."

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey (for the bill) with Mr. BARCHFELD (against).

On the wool bill:

Mr. LITTLETON (in favor) with Mr. DWIGHT (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. CARTER (for the bill) with Mr. KAHN (against).

Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi (for the bill) with Mr. MATTHEWS (against).

Mr. DENT (for the bill) with Mr. GRIEST (against).

Mr. SULZER (for the bill) with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. DIFENDERFER (for the bill) with Mr. LAFEAN (against).

Mr. GOLDFOGLE (for the bill) with Mr. SPEER (against).

Mr. PALMER (for the bill) with Mr. MCKINLEY (against).

Mr. UNDERHILL (for the bill) with Mr. FORDNEY (against).

Mr. RICHARDSON with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. McHENRY with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. AYRES with Mr. CARY.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT L. TAYLOR.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I send the following resolutions to the desk and ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the same.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 476.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ROBERT L. TAYLOR, a Senator of the United States from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolutions.

The resolutions were agreed to, and the Speaker appointed as the committee on the part of the House Mr. MOON of Tennessee, Mr. HULL, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Mr. PADGETT, Mr. SIMS, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. SELLS, Mr. TILSON, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. JACOWAY, Mr. LANGLEY, Mr. ROUSE, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. BEALL of Texas.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the additional resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting seventh annual report of the American National Red Cross (H. Doc. No. 661); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of St. Joseph Bay, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 660); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named as follows:

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22343) to require supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, to submit their annual reports at the end of each fiscal year, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 480), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15361) to correct an error in the record of the supplemental treaty of September 28, 1830, made with the Choctaw Indians, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 481), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14084) authorizing the retirement from active service, with increased rank, of officers now on the active list of the Army who served in the Civil War, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 478), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22301) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city of Uvalde, Tex., a certain strip of land, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 479), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 22727) for the purchase of a site and erection of a Federal building at Santa Fe, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 22728) to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests; to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 22729) for the relief of persons suffering damages by the construction of the canal diverting the waters of the Mormon Slough into the Calaveras River; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 22730) to further regulate interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 22731) to extend the time for the construction of a dam across the Pend Oreille River, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 22732) to repeal an act allowing mileage to Members of Congress, Delegates from Territories, Resident Commissioners from Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, etc.; to the Committee on Mileage.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 22733) appropriating \$300,000 for the purpose of maintaining and protecting against floods the levees on the Mississippi River heretofore constructed in whole or in part by the United States; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 22734) to acquire a site and construct a public building at International Falls, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 475) providing for the consideration of House joint resolution 204; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the passage of House bills 36 and 4428, to afford protection to migratory game birds and wild fowl of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the passage of House bills 36 and 4428, to afford protection to migratory game birds and wild fowl of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AKIN of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the passage of House bills 36 and 4428, also Senate bill 2367, to afford protection to migratory game birds and wild fowl of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AYRES: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the passage of House bills 36 and 4428, also Senate bill 2367, to afford protection to migratory game birds and wild fowl of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the passage of House bills 36 and 4428, to afford protection to migratory game birds and wild fowl of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 22735) granting an increase of pension to Ann Charlotte Timberman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 22736) for the relief of P. E. Anderson & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 22737) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Louderback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 22738) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 22739) granting an increase of pension to Priscovia Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 22740) to remove the charge of desertion against C. S. Lockwood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 22741) granting a pension to Thomas Payne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 22742) granting a pension to Samuel Castell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 22743) granting a pension to Rhoda E. Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 22744) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of De Soto, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 22745) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Bess; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22746) granting an increase of pension to Rufus McCutcheon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 22747) granting an increase of pension to Callman Elbinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALBY: A bill (H. R. 22748) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hogan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22749) granting a pension to Esther Neddo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22750) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 22751) for the relief of Hannah Gilbert; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22752) granting an increase of pension to John Doss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22753) granting an increase of pension to James W. New; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22754) granting an increase of pension to James Lovens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22755) granting a pension to William R. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 22756) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 22757) for the relief of the legal representatives of William H. Stringer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 22758) granting an increase of pension to Perry Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 22759) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Petition of H. B. Grasby and 11 others, of Houston, Minn., against extension of the parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of William Coffman & Son and 9 other merchants of Warsaw, Ohio, asking that Congress give to the Interstate Commerce Commission further power to regulate express companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, asking for the enactment of 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of R. J. Welch and 6 other citizens of Newark, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of legislation prohibiting the interstate commerce of liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the Lawrenceville Board of Trade, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring a reduction in letter postage from 2 to 1 cent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the South Pittsburgh (Pa.) Board of Trade, for a reduction in letter postage from 2 to 1 cent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Chartier Valley Lodge, No. 571, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, favoring a Federal liability compensation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition of citizens of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Illinois Bankers' Association, for farm demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Camas (Mont.) Hot Springs Commercial Club, relative to irrigation of the Flathead Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of S. M. Flickinger Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., for enactment of House bill 4667; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Seamen's Church Institute, of New York, for enactment of Senate bill 2117; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Friedland Bros., of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against House bill 14060; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Philadelphia Board of Trade; A. I. Namm & Son, of Brooklyn; and the Central Foundry Co., of New York, protesting against House bill 16844; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Maurice Simmons, of New York City, for enactment of House bill 17741; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the California Club, of California, urging special appropriation for enforcement of the white-slave-traffic act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the American Anti-Trust League, asking that the Federal arbitration act be extended to the coal industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Y. Pendas, of New York, protesting against House bill 21100; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association of Elmira, N. Y., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of citizens of Milwaukee, favoring construction of battleships in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Group No. 611, Polish National Alliance, South Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the educational test in the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CRAVENS: Petition of citizens of Chant, Ark., for enactment of House bill 14, providing for a parcel-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of Marion County, W. Va., praying for a speedy report of House bill 16214; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of J. Q. Thompson and 46 other citizens of Windsor, Mo., in favor of building one battleship at the Government navy yard at New York City; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Grange of Putnam, N. Y., against reduction in the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: Petition of Buffalo (N. Y.) Union, No. 4, International Photo-Engravers' Union of North America, for enactment of House bill 20423; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the State Board of Charities of New York, for an educational test in the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of W. L. Baker, of Buffalo, N. Y., for enactment of House bill 16843; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Papers to accompany House bill 4823; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 4829; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Campbell Iron Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against enactment of House bill 16844; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: Petition of the Central Trades and Labor Council of New Orleans, La., protesting against passage of the bill to repeal the duties on sugar, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Papers to accompany House bill 17303; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Albert List (H. R. 22388); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of T. A. Pottinger, of Peru, Ill., for a parcel-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of A. J. Hug and other merchants, of Waterman, Ill., opposed to the establishment of a parcel post, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, in favor of the passage of the Lever-Smith bill with certain amendments, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Camas Hot Springs Commercial Club, of Camas, Mont., in favor of the proposed irrigation of the Flat-head Indian Reservation, etc.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the Congregational Club of Chicago, Ill., favoring an appropriation of \$66,000 to be paid to the contributors of the Miss Stone ransom; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Rockford Chamber of Commerce, of Rockford, Ill., against the proposed abolishment of the Bureau of Manufactures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Retail Merchants' Association of Edwardsville, Ill., in favor of 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Houlton, the Christian Church of North Newport, and Grange of North Newport, Me., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of J. P. Knowlton, of Morgan Hill, and Sylvan L. Bernstein, of San Francisco, Cal., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Patterson, and the Auburn Lumber Co., of East Auburn, Cal., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Memorial of members of the Christian Church, Farmington, Mo., favoring passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Joseph King, Armory Theater, St. Genevieve, favoring enactment of House bill 20595, to amend section 25 of copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Grange No. 177, Patrons of Husbandry, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Industrial Relief Agency for Homeless Men, San Francisco, Cal., favoring amendment to act for sailors' home; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of California Civic League, San Francisco, Cal., favoring Federal commission on industrial relations; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Captain H. J. Reilly Camp, No. 14, United Spanish War Veterans, San Francisco, Cal., favoring House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of citizens of San Francisco, Cal., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Portland Lumber Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Gibbs & McDonald and Charles Rothchild, of San Francisco, Cal., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petitions of the Asiatic Exclusion League and Office Employees' Association, American Federation of Labor, for enactment of House bill 13500; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Dr. M. A. Meyer, of San Francisco, Cal., for enactment of House bill 21094; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Municipal Council, United Spanish War Veterans, of San Francisco, Cal., for enactment of House bill 19514; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., in opposition to Senate bill 3175; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of California State Veterinary Medical Association, for enactment of House bill 16843; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Petitions of citizens of Mondovi, Valley, Gray, Springdale, Reardan, Addy, and Lamont, all in the State of Washington, urging passage of parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Northport, Boundary, and Aladdin, all in the State of Washington, urging passage of parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. W. Ulin and others, of Havillah, Wash., urging passage of parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Spokane, Wash., urging passage of Kenyon-Sheppard bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Spokane, Wash., urging provision in naval appropriation bill for construction of one battleship this year at a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Chesaw, Wash., asking investigation of conditions at the Federal prison at Leavenworth, Kans., opposing higher postal rates on newspapers and magazines, and indorsing the Lewis postal-express bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Washington and Idaho, submitted by A. D. Cross, St. Andrews, Wash., secretary of the Washington State Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, urging passage of parcel-post bill and law to prohibit gambling in futures on farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of members of Grange No. 1418, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring passage of House bill 19133; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of the Pinkham Class, of Somerville, Mass., for the passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCOY: Memorial of the International Union of United Brewery Workmen, Newark, N. J., favoring passage of Hamill bill, providing pensions to the aged; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, for enactment of House bill 20423; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALBY: Resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, favoring the adoption of Federal legislation for the protection of migratory game birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of William M. Lamere (H. R. 15088); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Congregational Churches of Chicago, favoring bill to reimburse persons who contributed toward the ransom of Ellen M. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Retail Merchants' Association of the Washington Chamber of Commerce, urging passage of Senate bill 3813; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against the passage of House bill 16844; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging the passage of House bill 19795; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Conference of the Methodist Church of Philadelphia, urging the speedy passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of St. Peter's Young Men's Beneficial Society, relating to Catholic Indian mission interests; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of German-American Alliance, of Pottsville, Pa., against the passage of all pending prohibition or interstate-commerce liquor legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, urging enactment granting pensions to nurses who served in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, protesting against the passage of the Dillingham bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, urging the House to appropriate a sufficient sum of money for the Tariff Board to continue its work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Society of Italian Immigrants in Philadelphia, protesting against further restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Natural Bridge (N. Y.) Grange, No. 497, in favor of the parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Oswego County Pomona Grange, of Oswego County, N. Y., in favor of the Page agricultural bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Domestic Grange, of Oswego, N. Y., opposing the Lever bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Domestic Grange, of Oswego, N. Y., in favor of a full parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Nest No. 1259, Order of Owls, for use of 1,000 acres of public land for camp purposes, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Religious Society of Friends of Portsmouth and members of the Men's Baraca Class of the First Baptist Church of North Kingston, R. I., for enactment of House bill 16214; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Central Grange, No. 34, Patrons of Husbandry, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorials of the Merchants' Association and Board of Trade of Pawtucket, R. I., relative to construction of the Rhode Island section of intracoastal waterways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of citizens of Boston, Mass., for passage of an old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of various citizens of the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky, for insertion of clause in

naval appropriation bill providing for building of one battleship in Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of residents of Lewiston, Mont., protesting against the passage of House bill 17485; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of 100 residents of Cut Bank and Musselshell, Mont., in favor of homestead bill of the three-year proof act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Charles A. Burrows, of Lancaster, Pa., favoring Berger old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, for enactment of House bill 20423; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of Kent Grange, No. 154, Patrons of Husbandry, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Group No. 233 of the Polish National Alliance of United States, protesting against proposed educational test in immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Memorial of Belleville (Ill.) Typographical Union, No. 74, for enactment of House bill 11032; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Belleville Typographical Union, No. 74, in favor of the Berger old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Belleville (Ill.) Local, No. 474, United Mine Workers of America, favoring House bill 11032; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Belleville (Ill.) Local, No. 21, International Union of United Brewery Workers, favoring House bills 11032 and 13114; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Belleville (Ill.) Local, No. 474, United Mine Workers of America, favoring House bill 13114; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: Petition of Highland Grange, No. 255, Patrons of Husbandry, in favor of Senate bill 5474 and House bill 19133; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Taneytown (Md.) Grange, No. 184, Patrons of Husbandry, in favor of Senate bill 5474 and House bill 19133; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Taneytown Grange, No. 184, Patrons of Husbandry, asking for passage of Senate bill 3; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of citizens of Greenville and Luzerne, Ky., asking that one battleship be constructed in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Kent Grange, No. 154, Patrons of Husbandry, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: Petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., for enactment of House bills 19405, 19406, and 19407; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of citizens of Cullom, Ill., for parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 2, 1912.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATORS FROM ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico as States in the Union having been accomplished in appropriate and constitutional form, and the representatives of such States duly and regularly chosen for membership in this body now being present, I take pleasure in presenting the credentials of the Senator elect from New Mexico, Mr. FALL, and announce his presence in the Chamber and his readiness to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The Secretary read the credentials of ALBERT BACON FALL, chosen by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico a Senator from that State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections having advised the Chair that that committee has passed upon the credentials, without objection the credentials will be referred directly to the Secretary of the Senate for the files of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to present the credentials of Mr. CATRON, Senator elect from New Mexico. I will